



Morecambe Bay Standing Conference

20 March 1998

Coronation Hall, Ulverston

CONTENTS

PROGRAMME & AGENDA	1
MINUTES OF MEETING	2
SOAPBOX CONTRIBUTIONS	7
Liz Vaughan, National Pure Water Association	7
Nicola Davies, South Lakeland Friends of the Earth	8
Stephanie Eastham, Agenda 21 South Lakeland	8
Willie Stanton, Roa Island Residents' Association	9
Douglas Bulloch, Blackpool and Fleetwood Yacht Club	10
CONFERENCE SPEAKERS	11
Coastal Management in North West Britain, Improving Co-ordination and Co-operation	
Dr Alan Jemmett, Project Manager, Dee Estuary Strategy	11
Sustainability and Morecambe Bay	
Notes from a presentation by Prof J N R Jeffers	13
EVALUATION	21

Programme

Morecambe Bay Standing Conference

Friday 20 March 1998, Ulverston, Coronation Hall

Registration & Coffee	10:00
Business Meeting	10:30
Soap Box	11:30
Presentation - Coastal Management in the NW	12:00
Presentation - Sustainability and Morecambe Bay	12:20
Buffet Lunch	12:40
Workshops	14:00
Conclusions & Tea.....	15:45

Agenda

1. Welcome and thanks
2. Election of Vice-Chair of Standing Conference
3. Minutes of last meeting & matters arising
4. Progress Report (Project Officer)
5. Agenda for Action (* paper attached)
6. Standing Conference
7. Progress reports on topical items (* paper attached)
8. European Marine Site (* paper attached)
9. AOB
10. Date of next meeting

Presentations

- Coastal Management in the North Westby Dr Alan Jemmett
Dee Estuary Strategy Officer
- Sustainability and Morecambe Bay - Are we all at Sea?by Prof J N R Jeffers

**Our special thanks go to the sponsors
for this Standing Conference meeting:**

**Furness Fish, Poultry & Game Supplies, Furness Waste Consortium,
Glaxo Wellcome, Kimberly-Clark, Seasalter Shellfish Ltd,
South Lakeland District Council.**

Morecambe Bay Standing Conference

Minutes of Meeting, 20 March 1998, Coronation Hall, Ulverston

1. Welcome and thanks

Councillor George Slynn (Lancashire County Council), opening the meeting, welcomed the Standing Conference members. Thanks were extended to Furness Fish, Poultry and Game Supplies, Furness Waste Consortium, Glaxo-Wellcome, Kimberly-Clark, Seasalter Shellfish Ltd and South Lakeland District Council for their sponsorship.

2. Election of Vice-Chair of Standing Conference

Captain John Green was nominated as Vice-Chair of the Standing Conference by Alan Chester (North West Water) and seconded by Brian Helliwell (British Gas Hydrocarbon Resources).

Capt Green was elected Vice-Chair.

3. Minutes of the last meeting (17 October 1997) and matters arising

The minutes of the last meeting were accepted.

4. Progress report

The Chairman invited Susannah Bleakley (Morecambe Bay Partnership Project Officer) to report on progress since the last Standing Conference.

Following the third Standing Conference in October '97, an Evaluation and Workshop Report was produced. In January '98 Baywatch, the Partnership's first newsletter, was published. 7000 copies have been distributed. In response to the concerns raised about Spartina, a joint meeting was held with the Morecambe Bay Conservation Group. 200 people attended this Great Spartina Debate. There was a valuable exchange of information between panel and audience including an explanation of the trials to be carried out.

Agenda for Action

Partners have contributed valuable feedback on the draft Agenda for Action submitted to Standing Conference in October '97. In February '98 the Management Committee discussed amendments and agreed the content of the current version (Agenda Item 5, Attachment 2). Putting together the Agenda for Action has been a key task for the Partnership. Six working groups have now been proposed to take the Agenda for Action forward:

a) Heritage Working Group

The first meeting on 10 March established two goals: (i) assessing priority sites and features suitable for interpretation work and (ii) preparing a Heritage Lottery bid.

b) Funding Group

John Hetherington (Environmental Planning Manager, Cumbria County Council) is convening a working group to secure long-term viability for the Partnership. It will produce an annual business plan and consider the Partnership's organisational status (including the potential in becoming a charitable trust or limited liability company).

Standing Conference members with relevant expertise or contacts are asked to notify John Hetherington.

c) Interpretation Action Group

Susannah Bleakley will lead action on interpretation of the Bay's cultural and natural heritage.

d) Sport and Recreation Group

Susannah Bleakley and Richard Greenwood (South Lakeland District Council) will assess the options.

e) Planning Forum

Vic Crumley (Chief Planning Officer, Lancaster City Council) is convening a forum of local planning officers to consider the Bay-wide implications of their work.

f) Tourism Marketing Group

The idea for a group to promote tourism interests in the Bay area was developed by the Tourism Workshop at the October '97 Standing Conference. Jim Trotman (Morecambe Tourism) is taking a lead in establishing the group which will develop a co-ordinated and sensitive marketing strategy for the Bay.

Susannah Bleakley described the place of these working groups in the management structure of the Partnership (see attached diagram).

Funding Bids

In addition to preparation of a Heritage Lottery bid, three funding bids were made to English Nature in March '98:

a) Local Interpretation Bid

An application has been made to support the project officer in her work to raise awareness of Morecambe Bay. The project would include an information review, interpretation materials and a schools day and would be overseen by the Interpretation Action Group.

b) National Educational Bid - Resources for Learning: Making the Most of the Coast

Susannah Bleakley has applied for funds for educational materials on behalf of a network of estuary project officers. The project would audit existing materials and curricula and develop a resource pack for Estuary Project officers and visitor centres, schools, etc.

c) National Grant Bid - Partnership of Irish Sea Coast and Estuary Strategies (PISCES)

With Alan Jemmett, Dee Estuary Project Officer, Susannah has applied for funds to produce publicity materials for PISCES, a forum promoting coastal issues. The materials would target two audiences: the general public and local and national politicians. There is particular concern that the new Regional Development Agencies will take account of the importance of the North West coast.

Standing Conference is asked to inform the Partnership of appointees to Regional Development Agencies so that coastal issues can be raised with them.

Work Programme for 1998

Key aspects of the Partnership's work over the coming months are:

- April ⇒ setting up the six working groups generated by the Agenda for Action
- May ⇒ preparing a second Bay by Day poster with events around the Bay for summer '98

summer '98

- July ⇒ Environmental Impact Assessment guidelines (CD4, Agenda for Action 3.3)
- August ⇒ Industry Roundtable (ITD 1-13, Agenda for Action 3.17)
- Sept ⇒ preparing a second annual Progress Report
⇒ producing the next Baywatch newsletter

The Standing Conference was reminded that the deadline for response on the Lune Local Environment Agency Plan (LEAP) is 15 May.

Those with contributions for the Bay by Day events poster should contact Hilary Wilson at the Partnership office by April 27th at latest.

The Chairman called for comments or questions. Willie Stanton (Roa Island Residents' Association) commended the Partnership's progress achieved despite tight resources.

5. Agenda for Action

Susannah Bleakley referred to the conference papers on the Agenda for Action (Agenda Item 5). Since the previous October '97 edition a huge amount of work has resulted in new commitments and new projects being included. A major addition is the checklist at the end which cross-references the Agenda for Action and Strategy documents.

Comments from Standing Conference members are welcome. Those taking the lead in an action that could be included should write to the project officer.

The Chairman asked for comments and questions.

Mark Hamer (Fleetwood Fish Producers) and Gerry Stephen (Fylde Naturalist Society) expressed concern about the building of a gas-fired power station on the River Wyre and about plans for gas-storage at Preesall. Chris Lumb (Maritime Development Officer, English Nature) offered to have English Nature's comments on this attached to the Conference minutes. [This has not been received in the Morecambe Bay Partnership office. For information contact Mike Beard in English Nature's Wigan office, 01942 820342.] Brian Rowe (Deputy Chief Executive, Barrow Borough Council) also responded. John Hetherington remarked that the Partnership would normally expect a specific planning issue to be dealt with at the local level unless it had bay-wide consequences.

It was asked whether PISCES included communication with the Irish side of the Irish Sea. Susannah Bleakley confirmed that through the Irish Sea Forum the PISCES Partnership was in contact with organisations all around the Irish coast.

Liz Vaughan (National Pure Water Association) asked whether pollution was included in the coastal projects under PISCES (Agenda for Action, Item 2.6). Susannah Bleakley explained that the members of PISCES are estuary project officers working on major partnership issues including pollution. PISCES would allow them to coordinate their efforts.

Ralph Henderson (Landscape Trust (Arnside-Silverdale AONB)/Silverdale Parish Council) pointed out the need to include grassroots people in working groups. Susannah Bleakley was pleased that Fraser and Freda Smalley (Heysham Heritage Association) had asked to be included in the Heritage Working Group.

Patricia England (Heysham Community Project) proposed a working group on human health. Liz Vaughan suggested that Dr Nick Gent of Morecambe Bay Health Authority might be approached for help with this. Susannah Bleakley said that Dr Gent had recently visited the Partnership office. She agreed that he might be asked to become involved with the Partnership by, for example, speaking at a future meeting.

Colin Peacock (Lancashire Association of Parish and Town Councils) asked whether cross-bay health issues were incorporated into the Strategy. John Hetherington suggested that the question of a human health working group could be considered in more detail by the Management Committee. (See 6.ii below)

Members' attention was drawn to the recommendation in the Standing Conference papers on the Agenda for Action (Agenda Item 5):

The Standing Conference agreed to:

(i) support the implementation of the March '98 Agenda for Action;

(ii) seek commitments from partners to contribute fully to its implementation.

6. Standing Conference

John Hetherington spoke to his paper proposing that Standing Conferences should in future be held annually (Agenda Item 6). The volume of work in organising the conferences reduces the time the project officer has for carrying forward actions the Partnership recommends.

Malcolm Dilley (Morecambe Neighbourhood Council), supported by Patricia England, felt that a year between contacts would cause members to lose the threads of developments around the Bay. He emphasised the value of informal contacts, particularly in workshops, and the networking opportunities at Standing Conference meetings.

Colin Peacock suggested that the business part of the meeting could be annual. The need for more frequent contact could be fulfilled by a less formal seminar or other session between business meetings. John Keen (Morecambe Bay Conservation Group) proposed that the Management Committee consider opportunities for informal contact that would demand less of the Partnership's resources. This proposal was seconded by Ralph Henderson.

John Hetherington acknowledged the concern expressed and proposed a compromise.

Standing Conference agreed

(i) that the next full meeting should be held in March 1999; and

(ii) that Management Committee should consider alternatives for informal contact between annual meetings.

The current proposals (2 April '98) are for a seminar on public health issues around the Bay to be held in October '98.

7. Progress Reports on Topical Items

Attention was drawn to the papers on this item. There was an additional short review on the work of the Sea Fisheries Committee. Members who wish to see a copy of this should contact Jim Andrews.

8. European Marine Site

Neil Fletcher (English Nature) gave a talk with slides on the features of Morecambe Bay which make it valuable as a European Marine Site.

9. Soap Box

Five speakers contributed to the Soap Box session. Texts of their contributions can be found in the papers attached.

Speaker

Topic

Liz Vaughan (National Pure Water Association)	Fluoridation
Nicola Davies (South Lakeland Friends of the Earth)	Nuclear power and nuclear waste
Stephanie Eastham (Agenda 21 South Lakeland)	Local Agenda 21
Willie Stanton (Roa Island Residents' Association)	Personal viewpoint
Douglas Bulloch (Blackpool & Fleetwood Yacht Club Association)	Morecambe Bay Sailing

10 Any Other Business

11. Date of next meeting

The next Business meeting has been planned for Friday 19 March 1999 starting at 10:00 hrs at the Visitors Centre, Heysham Power Station.

The meeting was concluded with a further expression of thanks to all who had contributed to the organisation and facilities for this Standing Conference.

Presentations and Workshops

Following the formal meeting, two presentations were given. Dr Alan Jemmett gave a comprehensive view of Coastal Planning in the North West, comparing work in different estuaries. Prof John Jeffers (South Lakeland Environmental Forum) challenged the audience to consider the meaning and the realities of Sustainability and Morecambe Bay.

Both speakers' notes are included in these papers.

The Chairman expressed the members' appreciation of the presentations and the Conference then adjourned for lunch. The meeting was reconvened in six workshops:

<u>Topics</u>	<u>Led by</u>
Sustainability and: Communities	Patricia England, Heysham Community Project, & Willie Stanton, Roa Island Residents Association
Fishing	Jim Andrews, NW & N Wales Sea Fisheries Committee
Industry	Stuart Klosinski, Furness Enterprise, & Dave Grant, Kimberly-Clark
Pollution	Alan Chester, North West Water, & John Pinder, Environment Agency
Tourism	Jean Metcalfe, Newton Rigg College, & Jim Trotman, Morecambe Tourism
Wildlife	Dave Harpley, Cumbria Wildlife Trust, & Alastair Crowle, RSPB

Ideas expressed in each workshop were presented in a closing plenary session. The workshop leaders' introductions and notes taken during discussions form the Workshop Report included with these papers.

The Chairman closed the meeting, emphasising the value of the Partnership and thanking all those involved in organising the day.

Soap Box Contributions

These Soap Box contributions are personal contributions by the named individuals on behalf of their respective organisations. Their content has not been checked by the Partnership for scientific accuracy.

1. Liz Vaughan, National Pure Water Association

The recent publication of the Green Paper "Our Healthier Nation" and its possible effect on marine life

Jacques Cousteau died recently and I would like to read you part of his obituary from an Australian publication. "The passing of Jacques Cousteau ends a magnificent life of ocean study, especially on "the sea" concerning man-made pollution affecting all that was sacred to his care on behalf of the world."

During 1971 a Clean Seas Pact was signed by 91 nations to prevent further pollution of world oceans, rivers, lakes and seas, by illegal dumping of hazardous and poisonous chemicals. *Fluoride was classified as one of those offending poisonous chemical pollutants.*

The British Fluoridation Society, which is a Government quango to promote fluoridation paid for by taxpayers' money, and the British Dental Association are lobbying MPs to change the 1985 Fluoridation Act to force water companies to add fluoride to the drinking water when requested by Health Authorities.

If they succeed this could have a marked effect on marine life as only 10% of the UK is fluoridated at the moment. We have seen great concern in Canada, which is about 60% fluoridated, that salmon has virtually disappeared from its West Coast. We are very concerned about the deaths of thousands of salmon and sea trout in the mouth of the Tyne every July/August. Newcastle upon Tyne is fluoridated and fluoride is possibly a contributing factor to the death of these fish as salmonids are very sensitive to fluoride pollution.

The Green Paper "Our Healthier Nation" has just been published. There is concern to reduce lead in drinking water to a level of 10u/1 within a time limit of fifteen years and water suppliers must continue to treat water to reduce its ability to dissolve lead. For most properties this will ensure that levels at the tap - that is after contamination by the property owners' pipes - do not exceed 25u/1. It is extraordinary that the toxicity of lead is recognised - most people know that lead reduces the IQs of children - yet fluoride is more toxic than lead and fractionally less toxic than arsenic. Recent research in America and China shows it also reduces IQs in children. Fluoride that is used in water fluoridation is the waste product of the phosphate fertiliser industry and in its acid form of hydrofluorosyllic acid also dissolves lead in pipes.

I am information officer for North West Councils Against Fluoridation. The vast majority of the councils in the North West have always upheld the rights of the people they represent to choose what medication they and their families wish to take and not have it enforced through the public drinking water supplies. New evidence has emerged from Dr Peter Mansfield of the Templegarth Trust who was concerned after testing the urine from some of his patients living in the fluoridated Midlands. He was shocked to discover some of them were ingesting up to 4 times the amount of fluoride considered safe by the Dept of Health and scientific literature. He launched a campaign for volunteers from Birmingham and Coventry and found that 60% were ingesting more than the maximum levels considered safe. This could be a real danger of health as fluoride is a cumulative toxin stored mainly in the bones. We retain 50% of fluoride consumed, obtained not only from water but from toothpaste, tea and fish. Dr Mansfield says that when fluoride concentration in the bones reaches 9,000 ppm, the crippling effects of skeletal fluorosis can be expected - disorganisation and increased density of bone, increased brittleness, osteoporosis and osteoarthritis. At 6,000 ppm symptoms of early fluorosis will occur - joint pains and stiffness, backache. The level of consumption required to achieved the crippling effects is 10 to 20 mgs of fluoride per day for at least 10 years.

In 1994 the World Health Organisation warned in "Fluoride and Dental Health" that "Dental and public health administrators should be aware of the total fluoride exposure in the population before recommending any additional fluoride programme for dental caries." This was never done. We now learn that the NHS have no facilities for testing for fluoride retention.

Jacques Cousteau was concerned over the destruction of marine life. We should also be concerned over human life and good health. I trust that I have convinced you about the dangers of fluoridation and the devastating effects on human and marine life. Please write to your MP and say *NO* to fluoridation.

2. Nicola Davies, South Lakeland Friends of the Earth

Nuclear power and nuclear waste in the Morecambe Bay area

Here are two staggering facts:

1. The Irish Sea is one of the most radioactively polluted in the world.
2. At Sellafield, just miles away from here, is one of the largest concentrations of radioactivity on the planet.

If you just let these two facts sink in, it becomes clear that nuclear power and nuclear waste is a big, big issue for the Morecambe Bay area.

Just to the south we have Heysham nuclear power station and just to the north is Sellafield nuclear power station and reprocessing plant. Nuclear power stations produce radioactive wastes, some of which are gases and liquids discharged straight into our environment. Spent nuclear fuel rods, which are transported through our county to Sellafield, contain radioactive elements that will be giving off dangerous radiation for hundreds of thousands of years. And *no-one* knows what on earth we can do with it.

You will be aware that Nirex could not make a watertight safety case for burying it underground - for example this stuff produces gases as it decays. Furthermore it is pretty impossible to prove an area will be geologically stable for hundred of thousands of years.

In fact, as you realise that we haven't yet got a solution for dealing with the nuclear waste that's produced every day, you realise what a terrible legacy nuclear power will have. People will probably still be dealing with this waste a thousand years from now.

Sellafield is one of only a handful of nuclear reprocessing plants in the world, so there's a lot of nuclear waste from many countries stored at that site. A lot of people are not aware that reprocessing is an entirely unnecessary procedure. Spent nuclear fuel rods are dangerous waste, a mix of radioactive elements. Reprocessing in no way renders it safe. It merely extracts the uranium and plutonium and produces more radioactive pollution in the process.

Apart from military uses, the plutonium was to be used in fast breeder reactors, but these never got off the ground due to big technical hitches. Now Sellafield wants to produce MOX fuel, a mixture of plutonium and uranium oxides. One problem with MOX fuel will be that it is relatively simple to extract plutonium from MOX for use for violent purposes, giving rise to a big security risk while MOX fuel is transported and stored. Furthermore, the MOX plant will produce yet more radioactive pollution. The waste from spent MOX fuel rods will be twice as dangerous as that from conventional fuel rods. More waste, and still no solution as to what to do with it!

We cannot contain or control radioactive pollution and we have no way of disposing of nuclear waste. Surely we should stop producing nuclear waste, stop reprocessing and just concentrate on dealing safely with the waste that we have already produced.

Radiation and nuclear waste are now part of this area's character for ever. We must take steps to minimise the radioactive pollution of the sea, bay, air and land of Cumbria and Morecambe Bay in the future. If we do not, we could find this could be the biggest threat to the area's tourism, fishing and hill farming, which together support more jobs than the nuclear industry ever will.

The Morecambe Bay Partnership should do all we can to make sure that we stop producing nuclear waste as soon as we possibly can.

3. Stephanie Eastham, Agenda 21 South Lakeland

Local Agenda 21

Local Agenda 21 (an Agenda for Living in the 21st Century) is alive and well in South Lakeland.

An important part of Local Agenda 21 is community consultation and participation and over the past five years South Lakeland District Council has employed many methods to increase understanding and "get people talking".

For example, we have held Environmental Focus Events - attended by approximately 200 representatives from local organisations, businesses, conservation groups etc. We formed South Lakeland Environmental Forum, which holds workshops on a range of economic, social and environmental issues. We have formed South Lakeland Communities Charitable Trust which will help fund community initiatives or give help "in kind". Many projects have been initiated by South Lakeland

District Council, eg cycling initiatives as part of a Transport Strategy; 12,000 compost bins, some issued free of charge, some sold, as part of our Waste Minimisation Strategy.

These initiatives have formed a "top down" approach to put in place a framework to aid community liaison.

A Local Agenda 21 Team, made up of volunteers from South Lakeland District Council, Cumbria County Council, Voluntary Action (Cumbria), community workers, have joined forces on several occasions with Cumbria County Council's Neighbourhood Forum Development officers in order to support each other and avoid duplication of work. We visit parishes/villages to do community appraisals, eg mapping their areas, discovering their like and dislikes about their local environment and elements they would like to change. This is an attempt to find out how communities envisage their surroundings/quality of life in 20, 30 or 40 years' time. Any desires for change should not just have short term effects, but be sustainable over a long period of time.

As this is Local Agenda 21's required "bottom up" approach, it is important to facilitate these gatherings without introducing preconceived ideas. It is an important part of the process that communities look at situations through their own eyes as any ensuing actions for change must have the enthusiasm and support from the people themselves.

The days of Local Authorities giving people what we think they want and not what they "really really want" are gradually disappearing.

However, as far as the Morecambe Bay Strategy is concerned, this method presents a problem. Many people tend to forget they live on an island. When consulted, communities *do* look at environmental, social and economic issues - *but they are usually terrestrial* - sometimes involving water quality in local lakes, but not marine. People are concerned with transport problems, housing for locals, safe and convenient places for children to play, recycling facilities etc. Even in our latest community visit to Greenodd, a village very close to Morecambe Bay coastland, no mention was made of the coastal economy, sea water quality, or coastal conservation.

If it is not natural for coastal villages to discuss coastal issues, how much more difficult will it be to make these issues the concern of our land-locked communities?

4. Willie Stanton, Roa Island Residents' Association

Personal View

(The text consists of the speaker's notes.)

- Morecambe Bay Partnership attempts to take account of all legitimate activities around the Bay. Living in the Bay is a legitimate activity.
- I am not an activist.
- What is real: that which is written down or that which actually happens?
- Report writing seems to be endemic, and many reports are excellent. However, I find it disquieting that reports only ever emphasise the positive. Nobody ever makes mistakes!

We have a partnership, one aim of which is to communicate. But what really happens? How successful are our communications? In the Strategy document it stated problems are caused by misunderstanding, lack of information, an absence of lines of communication:

- Misunderstanding because of the language used - ie "interpretation" at summary of one of the last workshops
- Lack of information: more sometimes means less, especially if you are restricted to time
- Lines of communication, implying to and fro debate. The newsletter appears to be used as a marketing tool for the Partnership and could well be used as a comment forum for diverse opinions. Pat England's comments on the workshop held in November may have added a little chilli to the scones and cream content of the '98 Baywatch.

Pass the parcel situation of what happens to highlight the situation -

- eg Tees Barrage as an example of what goes wrong. Stated as example so as not to embarrass any present.

What I feel is happening in the Partnership

- I have called you somewhat unkindly in the past, men in grey suits. I change it. You are power pants. The partnership is so male dominated. Men have a structure of networking, which tends to be

exclusive, rather than inclusive. Don't sit together in little cliques with your pals at lunch or coffee. Talk to other people. Perhaps we should have musical lunch, or lucky dip lunches.

- Small groups have been used to validate the democracy of the partnership, its openness.
- My photo in the newsletter shows I'm at the Partnership Conference in name, but only actions show how committed the Partnership is to involving communities. PS I hate having my photo taken, please don't do it.
- Communities are not considered. Look at Tourism workshop last November. Reading their report one would have thought that they were involved only in attracting tourists to a wilderness area, certainly any impact on the local community did not appear to be mentioned. Look at North West Water's new plant at Salthouse with plans to upgrade it and put in education facilities. I would not want my children encouraged to visit such an area!

What is said to me and answers

- What am I going to do to involve communities
On the whole, you are the professionals - the Management Committee of the Partnership and the lead agencies. If you really want to involve the community you will find strategies to do it and not just pay lip service. You will find it important enough to seriously take on board.
- Produce ideas, reports, strategies etc.

5. Douglas Bulloch, Blackpool and Fleetwood Yacht Club

The Morecambe Bay Sailing Association

The Partnership represents many worthwhile interests around the Bay and many thousands of pounds have been spent for the protection and development of these interests to the benefit of all. However, very little consideration has been given to the silent majority who use the waters for its own sake with no detriment to the sea, the Bay or the wildlife within it. The Royal Yachting Association often attend this group but MBSA maintain that they cannot fairly wear the hats of the noisy minority and this up-to-now silent majority.

The MBSA represents these people who own small often old boats kept and sailed for many years from the tributaries of the Bay. I do not refer to the speed boat, water ski and Jet ski fraternity who incidentally benefit from local authority facilities mostly without charge. They bring their craft speed about making a noise cause pollution create disturbance and push off home again when the tide goes out. Many of us had boats before we had cars. The MBSA consists of 14 sailing clubs many of whom have been around for over 75 years. They are: Arnside SC, Barrow Sea Sports Assoc., Blackpool Light Craft Club, Blackpool and Fleetwood YC, Coniston SC, Fleetwood Harbour YC, Glasson SC, Morecambe and Heysham YC, Ribble Cruising Club, Roa Island Boat Club, South Windermere YC, Wardleys YC, West Lancs YC and Wyre Sailing Club.

These boat owners sail for pleasure, pay considerable sums (which were originally slipped in at peppercorn rents with great promises) amounting now to many thousands of pounds each year to local authorities yet receive no benefits for their payments or recognition of their existence except as a cow to be milked as much as possible. I do not include vessels kept in docks and Marinas where facilities are offered. The mud banks of creeks and estuaries which have been ports since Roman times have now become lucrative money spinners. These creeks and estuaries are steadily silting up because of local authority policies on building and water extraction. The rights of navigation in these areas have been established. Some member clubs were so keen to maintain these rights when they were in jeopardy some years ago that they actually pay the Duchy of Lancaster some hundreds of pounds each year to maintain these rights for all.

MBSA is a responsible body formed some 25 or 30 years ago with the express object of maintaining the rights of all to use their beloved Bay and the open sea beyond. This they have achieved with considerable success over the years but now feel that this is threatened and that representation from MBSA should be part and parcel of this body.

Presentations

Coastal Management in North West Britain Improving Co-ordination and Co-operation

Notes from a presentation by Dr Alan Jemmett
Project Manager, Dee Estuary Strategy

A whistle stop tour of coastal management in the North West:

- Brief history
- Our successes?
- Our weaknesses?
- How are the coastal management initiatives working together in the North West?

Why Coastal Management?

- Lack of co-ordination of activity on the coast
- Need to protect rare resources
- Widespread ignorance of the opportunities offered by the coast
- Need to get people talking and working together

Driving forces

- A unique set of estuaries and shallow coast
- Underlying principles - wise and sustainable use of the unique resources

Relevant guidance

- House of Commons Environment Select Committee Report - Coastal Planning (DOE '92)
- Planning Policy Guidance Note 20 - Coastal Planning (DOE '92)
- Managing the Coast (DOE '93)
- Biodiversity - the UK Action Plan (DOE '94)

The result: Policy makers used the importance of the coast, especially for conservation, as a coat-hook to hang coastal management from.

The overall objective has to be to develop a long term co-ordinating framework to use the NW's coastal resources wisely:

- A planning framework that crosses the land/sea interface
- A mechanism to co-ordinate action
- A mechanism to make best use of resources and share information

So how far have we come?

All the coastal management initiatives seek to deliver similar goals:

- Sefton Coast Management Plan established
- estuary management strategies and partnerships (Dee, Mersey, Alt, Ribble, Morecambe Bay, Duddon, Solway)
- coastal management schemes (Drigg, Sefton, Wirral)

All are at different stages of development and all have different approaches - in response to pressures, politics and the character of the officers!

What are we GOOD at? (Has it all been worth it?)

- Partnerships established - Mersey protocol, Dee endorsement
- Policy frameworks established and up and running
- Action resulting from all this planning - action programming

- Co-ordinating frameworks help the flow of knowledge and information
- Provision of information

Site Specific Successes:

- Alt2000 - Alt week, raise awareness with community
- Sefton - long history and demonstrable track record, ability to attract funds eg the Life project
- Mersey - acting as a co-ordinating mechanism for EA LEAP. Lower Mersey, Alt, Sankey, Weaver. Avoids duplication and has wide remit.
- Dee - Education Project; Agenda for Action blueprint
- Drigg coast - marine litter project
- Solway - cross border co-operation and community involvement
- Morecambe Bay - Standing Conference good at generating local interest and media coverage. Soap box highly valued.

Where are we weak?

- Coast low on the political agenda. Opportunities with the regional assembly
- Under resourced, not a core area for local authorities. Rely on good will.
- It takes a threat to create a reaction
- Lack of power - it is not OUR estuary or partnership, it is YOURS
- Wide remit and temptation to move forward on too broad a front
- Delivery mechanism

The Partnership of Irish Sea Coastal and Estuary Strategies (PISCES)

Why set up PISCES?

- To tackle the big issues
- Strength in numbers and partnerships
- Share experience
- Influence policy and have a better chance of being taken seriously
- Put coastal management and coastal issues FIRMLY on the political agenda (North West Regional Association and the likely regional assembly)

(Words in italics are from OHP slides used in the presentation; others are from a text provided by Prof Jeffers.)

This talk is intended to review the basis for the sustainable development of the Morecambe Bay area, and some of the important considerations that need to be borne in mind in the future management of the area. It will then emphasise some particular points that do not appear to have been sufficiently stressed in the present Morecambe Bay Strategy.

Focus

"Current attempts by a quarter of the world's people to carry on consuming two-thirds of the world's resources and by half of the people simply to stay alive are destroying the very means by which all people can survive and prosper." World Conservation Strategy, 1980

It is important to set our local needs in the context of this striking and damning statement in the World Conservation Strategy of the 1980's. As members of that one quarter of the world's population that is already using two-thirds of the world's resources, we have to recognise that we cannot expect to use an even bigger share of those resources in order to further improve our standard of living. We must find ways of making any improvement within an equitable share of those resources.

Criteria

1. *Maintaining essential ecological processes and life-support systems.*
2. *Preserving genetic diversity.*
3. *Utilising species and ecosystems sustainably.*

The World Conservation Strategy defined three essential criteria. Two of those criteria have been taken up, but distorted, by politicians, and are now generally known as Biodiversity and Sustainable Development. Both of those distortions are dangerous and misleading.

The need to maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems has largely been ignored, perhaps because few politicians understood what was meant by the criterion. Pollution and disturbance are the two major threats to this criterion.

Biological limits

- *Limits of available energy flow.*
- *Significant and accelerating displacement of other species on a global scale.*
- *World-wide human impact on natural atmospheric cycles and natural resources.*

It is essential to recognise that there are fundamental biological limits to energy flow, species displacement, and the disturbance of natural atmospheric cycles and resources.

We are currently dangerously close to those limits in the ways in which we are managing our affairs, and the principal dangers are to our children, our grandchildren and our great grandchildren.

Acting locally

Local actions, including energy and resource conservation, recycling of wastes, and the exercise of choice are all essential but they are not enough by themselves.

We naturally seek to find ways that we can all contribute to an improvement in our use of our natural resources and our environment. Local actions are essential, but they are not enough in themselves.

We must learn to act locally but think globally, to live more simply, that others may simply live!

Attitudes

We need to question attitudes to commerce, politics, education and philosophy that foreclose on future options for the sustainable management of the earth's resources.

It is all too easy to accept attitudes to commerce, politics, education and social trends that we may feel are outside our control. It is, however, only by questioning them ourselves that we can influence these attitudes.

Current attitudes are closing down the options for future generations, and it is our responsibility to change those attitudes.

Policy options

- *Self-regulation and Market forces*
- *Setting of minimum standards*
- *Targets set by experts*
- *Community-led discussion*

The last 20 years has largely surrendered the control of decision-making to self regulation and market forces. Where these have patently not worked, we have relied on the setting of minimum standards. Those standards have usually been set by experts, but experts have often disagreed, and have not always been independent.

Today's emphasis is increasingly on community-led discussion, especially within local communities.

Irreconcilable conflict

There is an irreconcilable conflict between environmental sustainability and the material growth and functioning of the market economy.

Even the most efficient economic use of biological resources, as judged solely by market criteria, will continue to degrade those resources if not checked by enlightened cultural behaviours and appropriate government policies.

Surprisingly, it is the economists who are pointing out the irreconcilable conflict between environmental sustainability and the market economy. Dependence on competition leads inevitably to the growth of multi-national organisations that have no responsibility to taxpayers or local communities.

Of the world's 100 largest economies, 51 are corporations. Only 49 are countries.

Earth Summits 1992 & 1997 - Local Agenda 21

The UK is committed to making future developments sustainable by ensuring future generations will not be compromised by being unable to meet their own needs.

The Earth Summits of 1992 and 1997 mark a significant determination by the nations of the world, developed and developing alike, to take control of the use of the world's resources.

The UK has signed up to Local Agenda 21, and is committed to its implementation, both by John Major in 1992 and again by Tony Blair in 1997.

Local Agenda 21

- *Making future development sustainable*
- *Integration of environmental, social and economic accountability*
- *Community involvement in developing the Agenda*
- *Guidelines that reflect both local and global concerns*
- *Outside existing planning structures*

The provisions of Local Agenda 21 change the ways in which decision-making will operate, especially in relation to local communities. It is not yet clear how these changes will be implemented. How, for example, will planning authorities react to the rejections of their plans by a local community?

Guidelines are intended to reflect both local and global concerns, perhaps for the first time!

Predictability

Morecambe Bay is made up from complex systems that may not act predictably, even when they are subjected to only relatively minor changes of climate or management.

Few administrators and managers (or members of the general public) recognise the inherent unpredictability of complex ecological systems. The temptation is to think about them as relatively unchanging, except perhaps slowly and predictably. However, we are currently experiencing rapid and unexpected environmental changes as a result of man-made influences that have increased in both extent and scale.

Influences

The effects on Morecambe Bay may be derived from regional, national, multinational or global influences.

The influences on Morecambe Bay extend far beyond the narrow strip of land marked on the map and the Bay itself. They include the effects of agriculture, forestry, road-building, pipelines, new housing, air-borne pollutants, global climatic changes, etc.

We have to learn to think about these changes holistically, and not separately.

Interactions

The future of Morecambe Bay depends on the complex interactions of the environmental, economic and social systems. There is currently no real focus on those interactions in research, administration or national policy.

The interaction between the environmental, economic and social systems are complex and dynamic.

Because of the ways in which our public bodies are divided, there is no real focus on these interactions, only on parts of the systems themselves. We need to initiate research, management and administration that is capable of looking carefully at the interactions, and making changes in practical management and policies that reflect our understanding of the ways that systems affect each other.

Pollution threats

Our continuing reliance on potential pollutants (herbicides, pesticides, antibiotics, fossil fuels, radionuclides) for progress ensures that there will be accidents and unforeseen consequences - and some of these will be serious and long-lasting.

Too much of our economy depends on potential pollutants that will inevitably lead to accidents and unforeseen consequences. Who will accept the responsibility for these disasters? At present, the polluters rarely pay, and certainly not the full cost of the damage they have caused in the search for profits.

Limitations

It will not be possible to satisfy the aspirations of all stakeholders if we are to safeguard essential life support systems, preserve genetic diversity, and utilise species and ecosystems sustainably. Some limitations are inevitable and potentially divisive!

We need to beware of the temptation to believe that the interests of every stakeholder can be satisfied by some kind of compromise. There exist even now some issues which will demand that one or more stakeholders will have to forego their claims to the future.

Compromise and trade-offs will only go some way to ease the pressure on resources. Exceeding the limits of biological options in the interest of social harmony is not an option!

Stakeholders

Under the provisions of Local Agenda 21, it is the local communities that are the principal stakeholders. They have the right to query, and oppose, decisions made about their environment by regional, national, and international (multinational) stakeholders.

Local Agenda 21 changes the balance of power in the sense that local communities now have the ability, through community-led discussion, to query and oppose regulations, planning decisions, and conditions that regional, national and multinational organisations wish to impose upon them.

The proof of the pudding will be in the eating!

Competition or Partnership

We have to make a choice between the competitive policies which continue to deplete and pollute our national resources and policies which enable resource use and pollution to remain within the regenerative potential of our resource base and environment.

Current research suggests that there are two paths open to us for the future.

Competition, as in the past, will lead to the depletion of resources, and the stressing of the environment beyond its absorptive capacity, leaving communities to adjust to increasingly constrained necessities.

Partnership, where resource use and pollution remain within the regenerative potential, will lead to the evolution of continuous re-organisation that ensures sustainable development in the true sense of that concept.

Thomas Jefferson (1743-1826)

"I know of no safe repository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the answer is not to take it from them but to inform their discretion."

Thomas Jefferson died 100 years before I was born, but he has encapsulated, in delightful and illuminating English, the underlying concept of Agenda 21 that it has taken us another 170 years to rediscover.

The principal objective of the Morecambe Bay Partnership must surely be that of "informing our discretion".

Numbers

Total attendance : 91
Workshop sessions: 73 (?)

Evaluation forms: 28

General Comments

Frequency of Standing Conference

- Twice yearly, face to face. It's not "communication" we want, but interaction and exchange. The terms of reference of the SC: to guide the MC. We can't do this with 1 year meetings.
- The deferment of next conference for a whole year turns the constitution upside down - the management guides the 'conference' rather than the other way round in the interim.
- The suggestion about reducing the frequency of conference meetings and/or the format is worth looking into
- I understand that you do not want to run this sort of day every six months. However I don't think most people were there for the "business" side of the day. There is certainly no reason why you should feel the need to rewrite the agenda for action in order for the Morecambe Bay Partnership to have a participatory day every six months. Why not have a workshop day in six months' time, with workshops run by proven facilitators. If you don't have any sort of meeting for a year you may lose touch with anything resembling grassroots.
- **Constitution:** At 2.2 states: " The terms of reference of the Standing Conference shall be – to guide the Management Committee on the implementation of the Strategy and other matters." You must have noticed that the energy of the Strategy is changing as people settle to the task of actually making changes to improve the quality of life in the area for all beings. This is the WRONG time to cut off the channels between members for such long periods.
- **Decision to hold yearly meetings.** At least four members of the management committee spoke for a motion they were already committed to; not enough encouragement/time allowed for debate, especially since a motion to keep to the twice yearly format was placed and seconded at the start. The Chair asked for more debate on the subject but I had my hand up to make a point on the Constitution when the Chair began summing up. The Chair should have warned the Conference he was taking the decision and asked if there were more comments before he asked for a vote. The venue for a meeting in one year had been chosen. I feel the decision was rushed and pushed. The general feeling was people care about the pressure on Susannah, but feel a worthwhile and grossly-underfunded project should be maintained with more resources. (see New Release from Chris Lumb: 'More grant money than ever before for marine & coastal projects'.)

Opportunity to meet/speak

- Excellent occasion for meeting large variety of people
- good opportunities to meet and speak with people in other disciplines
- More human contact would be very advantageous
- Not enough time to chat and for workshops
- Need to think of ways to include individuals who may have interesting points to make but are not included in this Forum because they have no particular 'discipline' or vested interest.
- There were occasional flare ups of old antagonisms and 'running sore' problems. They took too much time and distracted from main themes.
- No mention of MBP approach to pollution - disappointing.

Lunch

- Resource communities - charge me for lunch
- Lunch was excellent - a pity and somewhat insulting for the caterers that we were so late for it and it was so rushed.
- A very good lunch

Venue

- Venue was not ideal. PA system poor and geography of the building layout caused problems
- Still have difficulty hearing speakers
- Difficult to hear some of the speakers
- chairman indistinct, microphone not working?

- The chairperson didn't speak clearly and I couldn't tell what he was saying half the time

Organisation

- The organisation and presentation etc was great. Obviously took a lot of planning and hard work but much appreciated.
- Very well organised and much appreciated.
- Very well organised and most enjoyable

Format of the day

General comments

- excellent, very good
- good content
- good (7)
- ok (4)
- generally good, but chairing could have been stricter
- very formal - not one to encourage open debate
- (more interaction needed)

Timing

- too long (2)
- more time needed
- timing awry
- a bit too expansive - too much to fit into one day
- too busy because format is so good - need resources/grants to continue as we are - trust
- put guest speakers first, so they aren't feeling rushed at the end
- needs stricter chairmanship to keep to timetable
- need a new chairman
- Timing is critical. The soap box in particular needed tighter chairing. Otherwise excellent.
- chairing & timekeeping was bad
- Late lunch is not a good idea. I had to leave at 16.00 so I missed the end of the meeting
- overran badly on time
- reasonable but allowed to run beyond time schedule

;

- ok (2)
- good/fair
- good (3)
- interesting (2)
- very informative
- bit boring (2)
- too complex
- could do to speed it up
- too long (2)
- severe overrun
- suggest an extra day
- allowed to run beyond time scheduled
- should be more controlled
- more tightly chaired please
- very well run - recognise difficulty in getting feedback on Agenda for Action
- chairman hard to hear
- chairman not easily heard despite PA

Soapbox

General

- interesting
- very informative
- very good
- excellent (2)
- a bit bizarre in places but democratically acceptable and useful
- perhaps speakers could have been introduced more clearly
- the soap box should be given longer to accommodate more speakers

Timing

- a good idea, so long as participants do not go over allotted time
- need to be held to time
- too long, far too long,
- went on too long
- some went on too long
- individual inputs went on too long
- speakers went on too long
- oh my god need a time limit
- poor - ill-timed/rambling
- I went on too long - sorry - & I didn't mean to upset you

Speakers/Topics

- less repeat appearances
- better vetting of speakers
- certain of the subjects discussed were not directly related to the conference aims
- avoid irrelevant pressure groups eg fluoridation
- seemed to be hijacked rather by higher level issues?
- would like more soapboxes from independent people

Presentations

General

Guest speakers should be introduced and thanked from the chair

Coastal Planning in the North West

- very interesting and informative
- very interesting
- well delivered and interesting
- interesting but forced to rush
- quite interesting
- fell asleep
- dull- not sure I learned anything
- boring - no substance
- bit dry, rather dull
- no mention of controlling polluting companies
- picked up community
- very good (2)
- good (4)
- good comparisons between projects
- fair, acceptable, ok
- disappointing, not a competent speaker
- poor presentation
- poor delivery
- rather muddled - I didn't understand his message
- vague
- some nice photographs but not much content (?)

Sustainability & Morecambe Bay

- excellent (8)
- excellent but speaker forced to rush
- best presentation I've seen for a long time
- very good (3)
- very good but Prof Jeffers was too clever for me
- good (2)
- especially good - more independent presentation
- good speaker and good material
- very acceptable
- ok
- stimulating (2) - I woke up
- provocative
- very provocative
- very challenging - will people respond?
- thought provoking, very thought-provoking
- refreshing
- entertaining
- worthwhile
- very interesting (2)
- well-presented (2)
- well put together
- reminded us all what we were all here for
- no vested interest
- Questions and discussion would have been useful
- no time for questions
- The speaker was very well informed about matters and conveyed his enthusiasm across to the audience.
- An interesting discourse which highlighted the gap between the ecology of the Bay and the expectations of the Bay-users. In fact the ecology of the Bay is even more complex than John Jeffers' account.

Suggestions for future presentations

- **Sedimentation** and the ultimate land reclamation in the Bay would be of interest/concern to everyone
- Impact of tidal barrage scheme
- What are the directional changes in pollution, sedimentation etc, which can be detected which may be harmful - Title "Towards the Brink"
- A rep from industry to talk about **Pollution** in and around the Bay
- Pollution
- Light and noise pollution
- Developments on sewage treatment
- Nuclear discharge - leaks etc
- Presentation by CORE
- The community-owned **Harlock Hill** Wind Turbines (Baywind),
- Baywind turbines - Horlock Hill

Other issues

- Human health issues
- Transport (Health, housing & transport have to be addressed before anything else)
- Genetic engineering
- Green Roundtable - ie not NWW or Nuclear Electric
- Forums if not independent presentation

Evaluation

Workshops

Communities Workshop - Evaluations - Oct '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	7			7
Worthwhile	4	2		6
Well-organised	3	2	1	6

What would make the workshops better?

- More of them.
- More time!
- 2 or 3 more participants.
- It was good - a really useful opportunity to build trust. I'm glad we did it.

Communities Workshop - Evaluations Mar '98

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	5			5
Worthwhile	7			7
Well-organised	2	2	1	5

What would make the workshops better?

- agenda first -
- more time, more help
- more information on other workshops with overlapping interests
- Cross fertilisation from other work groups
- other people with other interests mixing in
- a balance of people - including those not necessarily regarding a title as a burning issue
- difference mix of people - eg industry in community
- as a progression - workshops made up of people from different disciplines - face to face discussion
- variety of interests represented in workshops

Communities Workshop - List of Participants

Pat England (Group leader)	Heysham Community Project
Willie Stanton (Group leader)	Roa Island Residents Committee
Malcolm Dilley	Morecambe Neighbourhood Council
Stephanie Eastham	Agenda 21 South Lakeland
Joyce Holden	Lancashire County Council
Anita Stirzaker	South Lakeland Friends of the Earth
Angela Singleton	Warton Village Society
William Smith	Poulton Residents Association

Fishing Workshop - Evaluations - Oct '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	2			2
Worthwhile	2	1		3
Well-organised	1	1		2

What would make the workshops better?

- Very worthwhile discussion - I was really pleased that the fishermen were leading and running this workshop.

- I had the impression there is nothing wrong with the fishing from the fisherman's viewpoint. They just want more enforced legislation for the benefit of locals.

Fisheries Workshop - Evaluations - Mar '98

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	1	1		2
Worthwhile		2		2
Well-organised	1	1		2

What would make the workshops better?

- more time
- bringing together overlapping issues ie fisheries and wildlife

Fishing Workshop - List of Participants

Jim Andrews (Group leader)	NW & N Wales Sea Fisheries Committee
Mark Hamer	Fleetwood Fish Producers Organisation
Russell Hollowood	National Heritage Fishing Centre
Geoff Horrocks	Wyre Borough Council
John Keen	Morecambe Bay Conservation Group
D P R Knight	Holker Estates/Roose & Walney Sand & Gravel
Dick Langley	Local fisherman
Judy Palmer	Cumbria County Council
William Rhodes	Royal Yachting Association
Martin Somers	Morecambe Dinghy Angling Club
Roger Unsworth	MAFF
Craig Worthington	Local fisherman
Alan Wordie	Boughton Estates Ltd

Industry Workshop - Evaluations - Oct '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	5			5
Worthwhile	5			5
Well-organised	4	1		5

What would make the workshops better?

- Industry workshop was very well facilitated, stimulating, open and constructive.
- More critical view needed on which topics within the workshop would lead to useful discussion. Too much was attempted for the time available.
- Ensure good leadership with a thought-out agenda.
- Excellent, vibrant debate, enthusiastically led, well-informed, high quality discussion.

Industry Workshop - Evaluations - Mar '98

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting		1		1
Worthwhile			2	2
Well-organised				0

What would make the workshops better?

- Over-structured to the extent that we couldn't discuss what people wanted to.

- These can easily become "just" talking shops - it would be useful to pursue the outcomes in more depth.
- Industry workshop failed to cover any new ground/ideas
- (very detailed comments from Nicola Davies)

Industry Workshop - List of Participants

Stuart Klosinski (Group leader)	Furness Enterprise
Dave Grant (Group leader)	Kimberly Clark Ltd
Nicola Davies	South Lakeland Friends of the Earth
Pascal Desmond	Transport 2000, North Lancs
Richard Greenwood	South Lakeland District Council
Brian Harper	Lancashire County Council
Brian Helliwell	British Gas Hydrocarbon Resources Ltd
Colin Henderson	Nuclear Electric
Ralph Henderson	Landscape Trust (Arnside-Silverdale AONB) Silverdale Parish Council
John Hetherington	Cumbria County Council
Brian Jones	Ramblers' Assocn-CPRE Lancs-FOLD
Chris Lumb	English Nature
Cllr George Slynn	Lancashire County Council
Fraser Smalley	Heysham Heritage Association
Barry Smith	Poulton Residents Association
Sid Thompson	ICI Floropolymers
Liz Vaughan	National Pure Water Association

Pollution Workshop - Evaluations - Octo '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	6	3		9
Worthwhile	7	4		11
Well-organised	3	5		8

What would make the workshops better?

- Workshop topics very wide - perhaps more specific in future.
- Input from more knowledgeable members on scientific matters.
- Reduce the burden on the spokesman/leader by providing a note-taker.
- Maybe a tighter framework perhaps to focus people's minds.
- There should be a specific task which the workshop is asked to complete.
- Discussion lacked energy - don't know why.

Pollution Workshop - Evaluations - Mar '98

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊖	Total Respondents
Interesting	5	1		6
Worthwhile	3	2		5
Well-organised	3	2		5

What would make the workshops better?

- Disastrous to have it chaired by NWW/EA. It was very acrimonious. We need facts not education
- Knowing who was who (can't read badges at a distance)

Pollution Workshop - List of Participants

Alan Chester (Group leader)	North West Water Ltd
John Pinder (Group leader)	Environment Agency
Frank Brooks	Grange Town Council
Mrs J Deighton	Witherslack Meathop & Ulpha Parish Council
Vic Gray	Arnside Parish Council
Leslie Hadwin	Lower Allithwaite Parish Council
Barry Hankin	Transport 2000, North Lancs
Tom Hayhurst	Arnside Sailing Club
Helen Jones	Lake District National Park Authority
John Macer, FIFM	Salmon & Trout Association
Steve Manning	Flookburgh & M'cambe Bay Fishermen's Assocn
Gerry McLaughlin	Environment Agency
Geoffrey Moore	River Lune Watersports
Prof A D Pickering	Institute of Freshwater Ecology
Brian Rowe	Wyre Borough Council
Richard Scott	Institute of Terrestrial Ecology
Peter Westby	Canatxx Energy Ventures
Dick White	Joint Groups Against Western Bypass

Tourism Workshop - Evaluations - Oct '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	☹	Total Respondents
Interesting	11			11
Worthwhile	10	1		11
Well-organised	9	2		11

What would make the workshops better?

- OK - present format.
- More structure to the discussion.
- Fewer topics.
- The two hours was up in no time, and I am sure could have gone on much longer.
- Worked brilliantly, very positive outcomes - Let's do this again.

Tourism Workshop - Evaluations - Mar '98

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	☹	Total Respondents
Interesting	4			4
Worthwhile	4			4
Well-organised	4			4

What would make the workshops better?

- work well now
- if some people would not talk for the sake of talking. Jean did well to get us finished on time

Tourism Workshop - List of Participants

Jean Metcalfe (Group leader)	Newton Rigg College
Jim Trotman (Group leader)	Morecambe Bay Tourism
Eileen Blamire	Lancaster City Council
Mr J N Briggs	Lower Holker Parish Council
Douglas Bulloch	Blackpool & Fleetwood Yacht Club
Bob Crompton	Blackpool & Fleetwood Yacht Club
Bill Mitton	Arnside Village Society
Ron Sands	Lancaster Tourism
Daniel Satterthwaite	Egton Parishlands Trust

Wildlife Workshop - Evaluations - Oct '97

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊗	Total Respondents
Interesting	7			7
Worthwhile	6	3		9
Well-organised	5	2		7

What would make the workshops better?**Wildlife Workshop - Evaluations - Mar '98**

I found the workshop:	☺	☹	⊗	Total Respondents
Interesting	4	2		6
Worthwhile	2	3		5
Well-organised	1	4		5

What would make the workshops better?

- leaders change around - eg fisheries leader move on to wildlife
- to have an agreed agenda/pro forma available before the conference so that any matters of importance to the partnership as a whole might get a good airing ie produced with chapter and verse
- a room without loads of banging and construction work

Wildlife Workshop - List of Participants

Dave Harpley (Group leader)	Cumbria Wildlife Trust
Alastair Crowle (Group leader)	RSPB North Region
Malc Armstrong	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers
Myles Bateman	Warton Village Society
Tony Benson	Grange & District Natural History Society
T A Brennand	Witherslack Meathop & Ulpha Parish Council
Richard Coates	Witherslack Meathop & Ulpha Parish Council
Neil Fletcher	English Nature
George Handley	Heversham Parish Council
Pat Lowe	Grange & District Wildfowlers Association
Jack Sheldon	Morecambe Bay Wader Group
Martin Sherlock	North Lancashire Naturalists Group, LWT
Gerry Stephen	Fylde Naturalists Society
Eric Totty	Lakeland Canoe Club