Meeting to be held on Tuesday 22 November 2022
Venue: Dunblane Cathedral Halls

Agenda

6.00 pm – Quarterly Meeting meeting start – 18:05
The following documents are on Meeting Documents | ForthDSFB (Password – Enforcement1868).

Present	Apologies
AB – Alison Baker	
JMk – John McKenzie	
JL – Jonathan Louis	
CS – Craig Somerville	
CT – Chris Thomas	
GO – Graham Owens	
SJ – Steve Jones	
AD – Ali Dickson	
JM – Jamie Muir	
TC- Tony Cameron	
PY – Peter Yates	
FS – Fiona Simpson	
DR – Dorothy Reid	

Item			
1.0	**Welcome and introductions:**	**JMcK**	10
	1.1 Confirmation of the appointment of Dorothy Reid from Stirling Council.	AB	
	AB advised on legal position for appointment of Dorothy Reid representing Stirling Council as advisor, but unable to vote. All other privileges and requirements stand.		
	DR asks if it possible to be official board member in future. AB states that if a vacancy appears in future that is possible. **Board** votes for DR as non voting member.		
	Introductions by board members		
	1.2 Apologies for absence No absences		
2.0	**Actions from the minutes of the previous meeting – 23rd August 2022**		15
	1. Superintendent doc on Non Lethal Methods of Bird management requires final H&S updates	LF	
	LF -All clubs have been issued this to all clubs in the district, will follow with landowners after club AGM's.		
	2. Arrange separate Board meeting to plan 2040 + short term deliverables	AB	
	Actioned		
	3. Acquire research from Nature Scot on efficacy of Non Lethal Methods of piscivorous bird management methods.	AB	
	No such document available at this point. No research available.		
	JM asks why this research has not been done at a national level AB confirms nothing has been actioned by other organizations.		

	4. Develop spending plan for additional budget monies for Board review	AB	
	AB suggests separate meeting in January to discuss spending and budgets. **Board** agrees.		
	5. Circulate document to input ideas of "what success looks like" now and in future to begin future planning	AB	
	Actioned.		
	6. Look into options for mapping sonar, could help with fish rescues and river management in low water conditions.	LF	
	LF – Has option which is currently being tested and will report back in what sonar can deliver, eg smolt tracking etc…		
3.0	**Governance**		10
	AB – No change in code of practice relevant to FDSFB		
	Register of Interests. Currently completed by TC, JMk, CS, GO AB reinforces requirement for this to be completed.		
	3.2 Review of Register of Interests completion request - https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/CHN7WVY	AB	
	3.3 **Stirling Council Representative – update by Clerk**	AB	
	No further requirements.		
4.0	**Reports:**		15
	4.1 to Board members to confirm they have received the reports and raise any points for discussion.	JMcK	
	Confirmation by all board members that they have received reports.		
	TC raises minimum costs of fishery rates and that this could impact small scale fishery owners. These could be sold off for a fraction to the value. **AB** – highlights lack of control of valuation and done independently and requirement to pay. **AB** -Highlights poundage can change and affect value of individual fisheries, this could go down if overall value of forth increases. **TC** raises concern over non payers **AB** highlights option to appeal and we have a year to collect and manage. **AD** suggests proprietors could bequeath to board and points out value if they are not fished. **AB** highlights the value remains the same regardless of whether they are fished. **AB** highlights its not just about money but also about ownership. **FS** raises point about why assessors have increased amounts and if this is consistent across Assessors. **ACTION**		

	CS raises point that this could heavily impact smaller clubs with low ticket prices.		
	JM- would like to see further info from science team reports and wants results from smolt trapping and other funded activities. Questions whether board funding is best placed on smolt trapping. Issue raised again about lack of salmon & even brown trout. Lack of salmon in higher reaches of Teith. Wants to see more electrofishing on mainstem of river. **AB** – mainstem electrofishing requires netting across the river. **JM** doesn't need it to be spot on, just wants to see a trend/idea of fish numbers. **PY**- asks about smolt trapping results on Keltie, has not heard results of this year, asks JL. **JL** confirms he dos not know but results are in reports. **JL** highlights value of gathering consistent data and not stopping. Additional work done by Science team to investigate issues on Keltie that may impact. **AB** will ask Jo to respond to these comments and put together results of NEPS. **ACTION** **TC** -raises issue on Balvaig not included in operations manager report. **JL** provides update- JL asked for short term remediation before long term mitigation. SEPA not enforcing matter. Large amounts of silt entering river. Issue with landowner collapsed business, unable to hold accountable. Should not have a big impact on that area due to existing silting. Appears hope is placed on planning infringement rather then environmental law breaking. **CT** – raises option to take to fish legal if specific laws have been broken. **TC** – issue raised about catch returns showing he did not submit return. **AB** raises point about cut off for catch returns to appear in data. **TC**- mentioned that MS forms being returned to sender due to lack of stamps attached to forms sent to proprietors. **ACTION** Point raised about completing forms online. **AB** makes point that this will not change in the short term.		
	4.2 **Update on Loch Venachar Dam**	AB	
	AB introduces historic issues over the past 18 months and problem with fish passes. **AB** raises issue about time and effort to get aknowledgement that these are issues to be dealt with.		
	PY highlights similar issue on Glen Finglas dam and whether board is aware. **AB** mentions requirement to resolve Venachar before moving to others. **JM** highlights issue of Katrine potentially having too much water removed. **GO**- highlights importance of these issue and that veneachar will set a standard (test case) for how it must be dealt with. **AB**- second time police have been called in and happy to help, but raises point that we should not have to call police. Why is SEPA not responding and it has to go to police.		
	JMk /CS values effort by AB, JL, LF in effort in managing this over last two years and that this is the role of Board to tackle these matters.		

	CT – mentions whether press should be brought in to highlight failures of the two public bodies. **AB** says that this is their chance to resolve and improve before taking matters further.		
5.0	**Vision 2040**		15
	5.1 Summary update	JMcK	
	JMk – introduces concept and reasoning behind vision and purpose of the Board. Fish populations, migration, habitat. What success looks like, how we will measure it. Would like to agree next steps and actions. Cannot be achieved by the Board alone, but about how we coordinate. **PY** – feels that it needs to be achievable and manageable. **AB**- Highlights aspiration to do something and how we deliver that – including engaging with other organisations to deliver. **FS**- mentions the value of this and agreeing to take it forward. But believes that for the short version it should only be things that are achievable by the Board, and that second part of document incorporates wider requirements. **FS** wants to highlight what the Board can and cannot do. Must highlight what board cannot deliver. **CT** highlights that the vision is for the <u>Forth Fishery</u> and not the Board. **TC** asks if Board jobs are highlighted. **JMk** agrees careful wording required. But also important discussion about the board, its function, what it can deliver and how it functions and delivers. **AB**- highlights remit of Board, and that wider efforts are required to improve the Forth as specifications of remit may not cover all issues impacting the Forth. **CS** – opportunity to create an alliance with groups that care about the wider river as well as fish. And that the alliance could be responsible for driving change. **AD**- reckons this is good PR and very optimistic but also has concerns over viability. **AB** – mentions other examples of work being done and value of having the aspiration and quantifying how much it will cost. **JMk-** also agrees AD point about short term goals feeding into this. **AB** mentions increased funding opportunities through vision as well.		
	5.2 Discussion and agree actions and timescales		
	AB asks is 2040 right date?		
	AB asks for comments and for board members to input ahead of next meeting to bigger discussions **ACTION**		
	GO suggests 5 and 10 year plan to be laid out in same way and broken down by potential partners and allows us to plan action and engagement. **JMk** asks for final comments and suggestions to be directed to AB outside of this meeting and how we see the board functioning effectively in future. Perhaps a longer meeting in January **CS** asks if we have support from FMS and NatureScot about this		

	AB says this has not been shown to them, but Nature Scot will find it easier to help Board with this type of long term approach & funding.		
6.0	**Crown Estate Scotland Pilot extension**		10
	6.1 Summary of project and discussion on extension possibility	AB	
	JMk – asks Board about extending current project. **AB** – highlights history of project.		
	PY – asks about Bannockburn and it being a Burn. GW – provides response on process for confirming Burn as CES owned. **JMk** responds to PY about question of Burn being spawning ground.		
	Board votes to continue project.		
7.0	**Predation**		10
	7.1 Board members proposal for application for Licence to Shoot to Scare	JM/AD/PY	
	PY asks JMk to provide update to new Stirling member on impacts of predation and why licence is being asked for. **JMk** provides overview of issue **JM** – highlights previous surveys delivered who done at the wrong time. **JM** Demonstrates example of grey squirrel management has helped red populations and this should be the same. Does not feel that he has received non lethal methods document and does not believe that the laser pointer provided to PY did not work. Highlights how this could impact canoeists and other water users. Also raises issue of challenges to count ducks for the licence. Believes licence is best way to protect salmon. **PY** – believes it is Board responsibility to protect and enhance, his main concern that board is being left behind by other more proactive boards who are applying for licences. If we are not going to vote for licence then we must have a plan B and does not believe that our Board is proactive. Asked about the other Boards and if they are doing non lethal methods and have licenses. **AB** has made point that if they apply for licence then it must be done for the whole District and not just the Teith, Board must be consistent in its management of this issue more widely then the Teith. **JM** – does not believe there is any logic in how Nature Scot manages the issue and we are not challenging them. **JL** – raises similar issue about lack of formula for working out populations. Also mentioning goosander tagging . **JM** – raises issue about offspring will return to same place as they where born. Suggesting that these birds will keep coming back. **TC** – asks if there are any downsides to applying for licence. **AB** says yes, we would not be able to deliver on requirements. E.g. testing non lethal methods etc… **AB** states impression was to test these non lethal methods then consider application for licence. **JM** and **PY** don’t believe that this training by LF has been delivered quick enough.		

	AB believes that this should be done for smolt run. **Others** believe LF should have visited them by now to trial these by now. **JMk** understands the points that everyone is raising including issues with NatureScot. **PY** – has said no point in voting if we are not able to deliver on requirements. **PY** asks for commitment from LF on date to visit landowners and demonstrate success of this working. **JMk** says he will still put this to the vote if everyone wants to. **All** agree that if LF can visit shortly to demonstrate to all how these work and their success then happy not to have a vote at this point. Training and equipment required then it can be tested then Board can come back and vote on the matter. **ACTION** **TC** also raises point about potential effect of avian flu. **AD** would like a report on work delivered by LF and to see what he does. **JMk** will be getting direct reports from LF going forwards, he has also mentioned the quarterly reports provided by LF.		
	7.2 Board to confirm actions		
	Board agrees to close meeting and carry remaining issues forward.		
8.0	**Health & Safety**		10
	8.1 ForthDSFB policy review	AB	
	8.2 Board to confirm actions		
9.0	**Finances**		15
	9.1 Accounts year end March 2021 update	AB	
	9.2 Revaluation process update	AB	
	9.3 Budget meeting 2023-24 – set date	AB	
10.0	**AOCB**	**JMcK**	10
11.0	**Date of next meetings**		
	Proposed dates for 2023: Budget Meeting – Tuesday 24th January 2023 (6pm – one hour) Season Opening day ceremony – Wednesday 1st February 2023 (noon – two hours) Quarterly and AMQP – Tuesday 28th February 2023 (6pm – three hours) including presentation from Forth Rivers Trust on monitoring work. Quarterly and Public Meeting – Tuesday 23rd May 2023 (3pm five hours) Quarterly meeting – Tuesday 22nd August 2023 (6pm – two hours) Quarterly meeting – Tuesday 21st November 2023 (6pm – two hours)		

Agenda

	Board meeting closes 20:28		

Action list from meeting	**Actioner**	**Delivery date**
Enquire about assessors increase in basic charge for fisheries	AB	
Liaise with MS over lack of stamps on CR envelopes	AB	
Board to provide input/comments on 2040 vision before next meeting	Board	
Date to be agreed for LF to visit landowners at Blair Drummond to deliver training and equipment for Non lethal methods of bird management	AB/LF	
Re-issue LF document on non lethal methods for board to 'study' ahead of site visit?	AB	
Send proposed upcoming dates out for Board agreement.	AB	