

CSFP Board – Minutes – Item 2

Meeting: CSFP Board

Date: Friday 27th September 2019, 10am – 12pm

Venue: Pennine Gallery, Rheged, Redhills, Penrith CA11 0DQ

A **workshop on CSFP Strategy** was held after the Board meeting, 1245-1530. Notes from this workshop appended to these minutes.

Attendees:

Paul Barnes	Farming Community Representative	John Kelsall	Eden Representative
James Bickley	Forestry Commission	Keith Little	Cumbria County Council
Barry Chambers	Allerdale Borough Council	Ellyse Mather	Environment Agency
Janet Chapman	South Lakes Representative	Jane Meek	Carlisle CC
Doug Coyle	Cumbria County Council	Pete Miles	Environment Agency
Faith Cole	Derwent Representative	Stewart Mounsey	Environment Agency
Richard Denyer	Chair	Steven O’Keeffe	Carlisle City Council
Katie Duffy	United Utilities	Rachel Osborn	Highways England
David Harpley	Cumbria Wildlife Trust	Carolyn Otley	Cumbria CVS
James Halliday	United Utilities	Rick Petecki	CALC
Simon Johnson	Environment Agency	Elizabeth Radford	Eden Rivers Trust
Angela Jones	Cumbria County Council	Vikki Salas	West Cumbria Rivers Trust
		Adrian Shepherd	Yorkshire Dales National Park Authority

Apologies:

Adam Briggs	NFU	Chris Kaighin	Natural England
Tim Duckmanton	Lake District National Park Authority	Andrew Kendall	United Utilities
Pete Evoy	South Cumbria Rivers Trust	Jane Langston	Eden District Council
John Ferguson	Highways England	Adrian Lythgo	NWRFCC
Pat Graham	Copeland BC	Chloe O’Hare	Highways England
Tony Griffiths	United Utilities	Nick Raymond	Cumbria County Council
Julian Harms	Network Rail	Jonathan Reade	Highways England
Phil Huck	Barrow BC	David Sykes	South Lakeland DC
Sarah James	Lune Rivers Trust	Jeremy Westgarth	Environment Agency

Sharma Jencitis	United Utilities	Paul Wood	Allerdale BC
Ian Joslin	Network Rail		

Officers in Attendance: -

Anthony Lane	Cumbria County Council	Helen Renyard	Cumbria County Council
Kate Luxton	Environment Agency	Paul Sewell	Cumbria County Council

Observers: -

Richard Milne	Carlisle	Rebecca Thomas	
---------------	----------	----------------	--

No	Agenda Item	Action
1	<p>Welcome and apologies Apologies as above.</p> <p>AJ welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced RD as the new Chair. RD thanked AJ for the introduction.</p> <p>All presentations from this meeting are available in the papers posted on the Cumbria section of the Flood Hub website here.</p>	
2	<p>Minutes of the last meeting 4th June 2019 and actions AL went through the main actions from the last meeting. He noted an outstanding action under Minute 2: “AJ asked if residents are given a request to move cars to enable gully cleaning works to be carried out.” A response had been provided Stephen Hall, CCC Assistant Director, Economy and Environment. Residents are informed, but depending on operations, this can be sporadic. CCC is aiming to make the gully cleaning programme available digitally over the next few years to seek a more comprehensive response to this need.</p> <p>AJ asked Paul Sewell to ensure this matter of communications to residents around dates and times for gully cleaning to be made a priority for the CCC Highways Service.</p> <p>Other actions were completed, noted or on today’s agenda.</p> <p>Minutes were approved.</p>	PS
3	<p>Environment Agency Evidence Review on Community Engagement JC delivered a presentation. A summary of her dialogue accompanying the presentation is provided here:</p> <p>Slide 1 Who has read the document? The document was sent out to the CSFP on the 2nd September.</p>	

	<p>If you haven't read it, I would suggest that you do so and that you read at least some of the reference documents but particularly the report called "Doing Flood Risk Science Differently" from 2004. There are parts of this 2004 report that resonate very strongly with members of the flooded community.</p> <p>We would also advise you to read the actual research review rather than the Summary or the Slideshow which we feel have been over simplified.</p> <p>I asked for this Research Review to be included on the agenda for today because of the angry reaction to it from the flooded community and because it also provides a possible way forward for community engagement within the CSFP with the co-creation model.</p> <p>With this in mind, we wondered why the launch of the document was so low key and why no real link was made between this research review and the FCERM consultation that we took part in.</p> <p>Regarding the co-creation model, from past experience, a major shift in the mindset of authorities and agencies will be required if we are to make any progress.</p> <p>See statement on page 9 of the Research Review - "Good engagement is planned from the bottom up starting with the community themselves" (NFF / Collingwood Env. Planning 2018)</p> <p>Changes at Government level in relation to mindset, funding, policies and practices are also required if the CSFP has any chance of being successful.</p> <p>There was a very low key launch of this document – Why? The EA needs to recognise and respond to the questions from communities.</p> <p>Slide 2 -</p> <p>We noticed that tricky situations are mentioned in the document and we wondered if these relate to situations such as suggestions of abandonment of homes and / or businesses when there is no funding in place to compensate people – no wonder this leads to tricky situations and no amount of conflict resolution training will help in such a situation – it is madness to think that it will.</p> <p>Every avenue will have to be seen to have been explored before agencies and authorities go down this route and the funding will need to be in place.</p> <p>Questions for the EA – see slide.</p> <p>Slide 3 Core Principles</p> <p>We have highlighted those where we feel there are particular issues.</p> <p>If we look at - "Put final decisions into action as soon as possible". This is particularly pertinent when it is four years since Storm Desmond and those people who were flooded then are still under threat and are facing the autumn and winter with fear every time it rains.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>For some people there might be planning for a scheme in place for others (as for example Workington and Backbarrow) there is nothing. Is that fair?</p> <p>In this case, we know that changes in funding formulas and bureaucracy at Government level could possibly improve things and help us all.</p> <p>Slide 4 These are some of the statements I received following the release of the research review (and part of the reason for the request for this as an agenda item). I have included them because I think that agencies and authorities need to know how people are feeling not just about the content of the research review but about the bigger picture as they perceive it from the information they have been given.</p> <p>As you can see there is a lot of work to do but the community representatives are willing to work with authorities and agencies on the co-creation model.</p> <p>However, as we have outlined, every avenue to mitigate flooding must be explored and the funding must be in place before abandonment should ever be considered.</p> <p>RM stated that in 40+ meetings with the EA they say "It didn't happen that way, we have the data". Well communities also have the data and have been proven correct on many occasions.</p> <p>AJ asked for a point of clarification from JC. What is the ask of the CSFP today? Is it to take this to the national team at the EA?</p> <p>JK stated that that have been questions to EA management and to researchers. What happened following Rydale in 2004? Why haven't these outputs been adopted?</p> <p>AJ asked are these the views of CRAGG? JK – yes. AJ advised that we need to understand the role of CRAGG and any conclusions from today would need to be a CRAGG proposal.</p> <p>PB stated that the Evidence Review was very supportive but we need to take some key points in the presentation forward.</p> <p>PM asked what is good? What is questionable? What do we want to take forward? A sub-Group needs to be convened and authors of the report can be invited to Cumbria to hear and respond to this feedback</p> <p>RD suggested having a presentation from Pickering which would be useful for a future meeting. Agencies and communities need to sit down together to discuss the imperatives, budgets etc.</p> <p>RP stated that the parishes feel that there is a distance between what the agencies say, what the community actually feel and what actually happens. The onus is on the experts/agencies to explain</p>	<p>PM & Community reps.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>why they are saying a particular thing and taking a particular course of action. They must be prepared to listen to the communities regarding what is the actual effect.</p> <p>SJ stated that the terminology used needs to be clear and not too technical.</p> <p>RP stated that these are no longer extraordinary events and all communities need to be interested even if it hasn't happened to them yet. People do not believe that the agencies have the answers.</p> <p>JK stated that there is no political statement or financial strategy to show communities that if they are under threat from flooding what they need to do – this was not part of the research.</p> <p>RD said there was merit in feeding back concerns to the document's authors, but it was also important to arrive at a better understanding of the origin and intentions of the documents, the substantive issues underlying the proposals, and optimal processes for future dialogue and consultation before publication. He would comment again after reading.</p> <p>PB advised that there are 12 core principles to building community trust and the EA need to remain independent throughout the process.</p> <p>Kate Luxton noted that mental health implications as a result of floods were of great concern, both to residents affected by flooding, and RMA officers tackling flood risk issues. Anecdotal examples were used to highlight how RMA officers frequently witness confrontational behaviour when trying to resolve flood risk issues, leading to mental health implications in officers. Kate suggested that officers and communities needed to work more thoughtfully together to reach mutually agreeable solutions without conflict to be most productive. Kate highlighted the greatest benefit the CSFP could have to ensuring mental health implications were effectively considered, when making flood risk investment decisions, would be to influence the FCERM Appraisal Guidance to use a greater damages sum. Kate believed that the associated mental health damages sum, per household, was very low, and doesn't take in to consideration the cumulative impact of flooding on residents.</p> <p>JK stated that the EA have concerns because their Project Managers have said that they are frightened to meet with communities and this should not be the case.</p> <p>AJ stated that there is an offer for Project Managers to meet with the community representatives.</p> <p>JC advised that CRAGG applied for money from The Lottery for help with mental health issues caused by flooding but the bid has been turned down. AJ advised that this should be revisited outside of this meeting. KL advised that following Storm Desmond, mental health concerns were a high priority in discussions even with central government. FC stated that Cumbria have had several floods in a</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>short period of time and have suffered more than other areas of the country. The not knowing when and if it will happen again is very worrying and therefore mental health support is needed.</p>	
4	<p>Programmes</p> <p>a) Environment Agency Programme update PM gave a presentation. He reported the headlines have been reported to the Cumbria LEP recently, the Kendal drop in sessions are back on, 2000 tons of gravel have been taken out of the river in Keswick in the last couple of weeks and there are 14 NFM projects underway across Cumbria.</p> <p>AJ clarified that the additional funding was not for new schemes but to close the funding gap for existing schemes. It would also be useful to see where and when the gravel removal programme is taking place. PM advised that he would ask about this and he will send the link through to this group.</p> <p>JK asked about Carlisle Phase 2 and Eden Bridge clearance. PM will provide an update.</p> <p>ER has provided a link to a video on the Cairn Beck NFM scheme: https://edenriverstrust.org.uk/projects/natural-flood-management/cairn-beck/</p> <p>b) WEG programme update VS gave a presentation. West Cumbria Rivers Trust has been given funding of £3.5m to improve water environments, that is, wetlands, rivers etc. Not solely to reduce the risk of flooding. AJ stated that Cumbria is leading the way in Water Environment Projects.</p> <p>RD asked if there has been consultation between the communities and the agencies especially in South Cumbria? VS advised that all WEG projects are discussed in the communities at the time of proposal. This definitely happened in West Cumbria and should have happened in South Cumbria. The Cumbria Rivers Restoration Programme is a partnership project that is being led by the EA. SJ stated that there are 2 strands of strategy in Cumbria. We are looking for the best return on investment that we can get.</p> <p>RP stated that the capacity to take advantage of opportunities is at the behest of a charity and this is a worry. Cash flow is a priority for taking on projects as they are being led by a charity – The Rivers Trust. VS advised that CCC was offered as the “bank” for all the projects but as the Rivers Trust is the lead applicant this could not happen as it is too complex. AJ advised that funding going forward will look at this issue, we need to find solutions through the Catchment Partnerships.</p> <p>ER stated that there are multiple benefits in working in Catchment Partnerships and community engagement is ongoing.</p>	<p>PM</p> <p>PM</p>

	<p>PB stated that WEG has some benefits but the biggest barrier is the paperwork as it is so difficult to get through. FC advised that Sue Hayman MP has been working with DEFRA to get help with WEG projects. KL advised that there was still some European Funding available to be applied for. AJ advised that there was still ERDF money available.</p> <p>c) LLFA update DC gave a presentation.</p> <p>SJ asked how the current update of surface water mapping available through EA mapping on the internet will impact on this programme for the LLFA. AJ also asked what data is used to compile these lists. Section 19 reports?</p> <p>DC advised that the mapping for Cumbria shows at risk properties that haven't (in most cases) flooded so far but provide an indication of priority areas to reduce the risk of flooding from surface water. Most of the schemes in the LLFA programmes are sites that have experienced significant flooding recently and evidence of the need for a scheme comes from details in the Section 19 reports.</p>	
5	<p>Cumbria Catchment Pioneer EM gave a presentation of her paper issued before the meeting.</p> <p>JC asked how much has the community been involved? EM advised that strategically, this was limited but with individual projects there has been a lot of community engagement.</p> <p>PB stated that the CCP has been running for 3 years and the DEFRA 25-Year Environment Plan has only been available for one year. The Pioneer plans have been incorporated into the 25-Year Plan and it is important not to push the Pioneer plans on the back of the 25-Year Plan.</p> <p>FC asked how system mapping will affect the rest of the catchment? EM replied that if it is a useful tool it won't be used in isolation. A systems map doesn't just look at the physical environment.</p> <p>AJ stated that early community engagement is best, linking in with the rest of the catchment work.</p> <p>EM advised that the Pioneers were pilots and are due to come to an end in March 2020.</p> <p>PM advised that he would discuss the Windermere Lake Levels Project – Pipeline option with EM.</p> <p>JK asked about the Eden Market question – farms are being converted from dairy to winter wheat and barley – are Nestle still interested as the dairy has moved on? EM advised that Nestle were still very interested.</p> <p>EM advised that the intention was to produce a final report on the Pioneers by March 2020 and DEFRA were still deciding what the final report will look like.</p>	

	<p>RP stated that more local involvement needs to happen early on to help with the tool. SJ advised that this has been discussed with the Windermere Liaison Group and the Staveley Project is a good example of co-working with the community to understand what they would like it to look like in 25 years.</p> <p>PB stated that the report needs to be post-Storm Desmond and post-Agricultural Bill to be of any worth.</p>	
6	<p>Reports</p> <p>Members were encouraged to read the reports distributed prior to the meeting reflecting the wider work of the partnership since the last Board meeting. Questions can be made via CSFP@cumbria.gov.uk</p> <p>SO asked the Board to note the recommendations in the Communication and Engagement sub-Group report which asked for the Board to note no work will be carried out on the CSFP website due to the end of funding. In addition to this £6000 funding for the transition of material from the CSFP website to the Flood Hub needs to be found.</p> <p>AJ asked for funding source proposals.</p> <p>In answer to questions from JK, AL was able to clarify that the Flood Hub is owned and funded by RFCC. A Project Group consisting of officers from RFCC member organisations manages the Flood Hub website. Comments made by JK on the Community section of the website had been considered by this Project Group when it had met 2 days before and the response would be sent to JK.</p>	All
7	<p>AOB</p> <p>ER advised that the Eden Catchment Partnership Plan Part 1 is already available and Part 2 will be available from today. Part 2 outlines what they want to see happen over the next 5 years.</p>	

Actions Summary

Minute no.	Action	By	Status
2	Ensure communications to residents around dates and times for gully cleaning to be made a priority for the CCC Highways Service.	PS	Outstanding
3	Convene a sub-Group of Community Representatives to collate comment on the Environment Agency Evidence Review on Community Engagement. Meet with authors of report to feedback	PM & Community reps.	Outstanding
4	Gravel removal programme to be made available to the Board.	PM	Outstanding
4	Carlisle Phase 2 and Eden Bridge clearance update for JK.	PM	Outstanding
9	Funding source proposals for transition to Flood Hub website.	All	Outstanding

Appendix

Notes from CSFP Strategy Workshop

All presentations from this workshop are available in the papers posted on the Cumbria section of the Flood Hub website [here](#).

Introduction

AJ gave a presentation to introduce the purpose of the workshop.

The case for change

AJ gave a presentation outlining the principles of why a CSFP strategy is needed.

SWOT analysis on CSFP Working Principles

SJ gave a presentation to introduce this exercise. Delegates were divided between 5 tables and each table was allocated a facilitator to collate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats on each of the 5 CSFP Working Principles. Delegates were given 6 minutes at each table to carry out their SWOT analysis and provide as much comment as they could by placing them on 'post-it' notes stuck to a flip chart at each table. Each facilitator was required to feedback a summary from their table to the whole of the workshop.

Details of the progress achieved in the Cumbria Flood Action Plan were presented to support these discussions.

SWOT analysis feedback

Table 1

Facilitator: James Bickley

CSFP Working Principle No. 1: Collaborative Working – working together to share information, coordinate funding and provide communities with a single point of contact.

Summary

No summary available.

Strengths

People already committed to working together.

S19 Reports as an excellent primary service for all.

Lots of great examples of partnership working.

Spatial targeting of ELM's. NFM Test & Trial to take forward as we have. depth of experience and very relevant local priority.

CSFP a chance to network – some great ideas but.....

We are still here, learning. We are being serious.

Lots of knowledge in flood risk management.

Partner Agility.

Weaknesses

ELMS funding needs to be brought on stream for NFM in a meaningful way that delivers results – homes out of flood risk

What layer of community? – risk of confusing messages.

Data Protection legislation.

Funding boundaries.
Co-design solutions for catchments and communities.
Less top-down.
Bring together more community vehicles for better solutions.
s.19 Reports have thresholds..... 10 homes?
Disjoin – RFCC; CSFP; CMG; SCIENCE – Universal truths –communication.
Single points contact very strong if partners use it.
In community who knows what their “single point” is?
Lack of single funding source.
Lack of ELMS Test & Trial for NFM.
Silo funding.
Internal comms about what we have done.
Need NE involved dry/wet link.

Opportunities

Could go far but held back by Government policies, practices & funding
RFCC – Task & Finish Group – SCIDS Development.
Advancements in tech.
Not decision making – need to influence more.
Single system for seeking funding & articulating multi-agency benefits.
Development community – LLFA/EA/LPA's have identified issues with .developers in construction management phase and are working to produce good guidance.
We are established so could be a trial organisation to do things differently with budgets.
Share resource between organisations – embed staff – working groups.
Need the right people in the right roles – clear understanding of what the partnership needs to achieve.
Talking to local businesses about their flood risk – not just to their business but to the employees as well.
Business to make charitable donations to alleviate flood risk – can offset against Corporation Tax – reduce employee absence.
Big organisation acting as accountable bodies for smaller delivery organisations.

Threats

Need to be open to new ideas and new ideas and new ways of working – listening.
Misinforming information to communities with single point of contact.
Different layers of communities – Flood Action Groups; farmers; councils; anglers etc.
Political – climate agenda may supersede symptoms.
Just a Talking Shop – too big to make decisions and deliver.
Competing priorities.
Not understanding how collaborative working works – who talks to who and what do they share?
Conversation breakdown.
SPOC is one-way – communities are much more static than Agency merry-go-round.
Not aligned with benefit/investment periods.
Engagement with under-represented sectors of communities?
SPOC could work but not if they become a gatekeeper stopping communities access people with real knowledge or can't access the data themselves.
Movement of people.

Table 2

Facilitator Faith Cole

CSFP Working Principle No. 2: Catchment approach – improving what we know about river catchments and taking actions that manage risk from source to sea.

Summary

Strengths – Rory Stewart was on to a good thing when he introduced a “Whole Catchment Approach” and to look at managing flood risk from source to sea. Cumbria is leading the way and we are willing to try new things and be innovative which can open the door to different funding streams.

Weaknesses - Current funding formula doesn't align with a whole catchment approach. The locus is on urban areas only. It ends up being hand to mouth funding – lack of funding to keep CaBA/CSFP together. Some river catchments straddle organisational boundaries.

We don't understand fully the link between land and sea, coastal areas are not as high on the agenda as inland areas.

Planners currently don't have to consider catchment management plans.

Opportunities – To share more technical data; better communications with all riparian owners; better understanding of the rivers function especially understanding when to speed/slow.

Threats – Funding.

Strengths

It's a natural boundary recognised by the Jet Stream.

CMG's – Catchment Partnerships.

We are leading the way in the UK.

Considers all water planning in the catchment.

Climate change scenarios – new questions.

Catchment scale interventions and activities/actions are better able to cope with climate change.

Has introduced greater partnership.

Partnerships at different levels – local working groups; catchment partnerships; CSFP.

Communication and common themes are being shared.

Weaknesses

Do we know impacts of climate change?

Organisational boundaries threatens conversations.

Do the general public know about catchments?

Groups can get to be too big and then it can be difficult to progress.

Bigger picture required at government level.

CMG's could have worked better.

It's not a material consideration in NPPF.

50 years of records is not enough.

Funding streams aren't aligned to catchment approach.

Understanding of the link between the land and the sea.

Catchment Partnership need to work on this.

River management not yet joined up – physically and managerially.

Separate river basin plans and FCRM plans.

Listen to people who know the rivers – communities.

Joined up thinking/funding required.

Data is useless in a flood.

Coastal retreat!

Opportunities

Catchment Management Groups – Catchment Plans.
Peat!
Disregarded conveyance in mitigation.
Better data sharing.
Use of local land features to hold the flow – cost effective.
Include estuaries in catchment.
Government to view funding on a catchment basis.
Coastal retreat.
Innovation/tech – funding is available; we have demonstrated that we are innovative.
Communication with all riparian owners.
Every river section with an understanding of its function; To slow – To speed.
“Neutral” object for organisations/businesses to work with.
Need to make sure every opportunity is considered eg Crummock Water.
Education of citizens.
Linking catchments to the health and industrial strategies.
Sharing of hydraulic data and utilisation of AI.

Threats

Difficulty of aligning partnership funding.
Hand to mouth funding.
Political boundaries do not align with catchment boundaries.
Funding for catchment based approach – Can always get delivery funding but hard to obtain funding for co-ordination and monitoring.
Lack of funding to keep CaBA/CSFP together as catchment partners.
Coastal risk not as high on the agenda in Cumbria.
This is where “resilience”, “recovery” and “managed retreat” starts to get discussed – very emotive and painful in communities.

Table 3

Facilitator: Kate Luxton

CSFP Working Principle No. 3: Integrated solutions – ensuring that actions reduce flood risk but also deliver wider benefits for people and also wildlife when appropriate.

Summary

Strengths – strong partner working; good small examples; networking has fostered opportunities; we are further on than most SFP’s.

Weaknesses – ease of small scale but not large riparian owners; planning regulations/owners limit us/no planning representative on CSFP; funding constraints – timescale – incentivisations; lack of comms visibility.

Opportunities – big money comes from RMAs, how can we influence programmes are incentivised; we need env. net gain policy; UU now able to seek funding for severe events OFWAT; climate change rhetoric – look at, for example, peat management or solution with duality of benefit; Riparian owner campaign; new CSFP strategy what do we need to lobby; coastal representation.

Threats – not all stakeholders represented; do we truly understand term integration; new designation of World Heritage Status is limiting; tension between public needs vs environmental benefit; environmental constraints can limit betterment.

Strengths

Wider group of people means you can innovate better.
Great examples at a small scale.
Secondments like Kate.

Need to make links to Health & Wellbeing, human health – get more actions into Public Health Strategy Implementation Plan – out for consultation.
We are further on than others – Integrated Catchment.
Strong partnerships working together.
Networks are established but too much posturing for position to drive agendas forward.
Sharing data working on projects together.
CSFP a place to network.
More secondments.
More cost beneficial, better for community mental health.

Weaknesses

CMPs can sometimes be too big to effectively move forward. More resources for smaller focus groups.
Funding silos.
Lack of social media visibility.
Different investment periods and different drivers.
Funding often doesn't allow true integration; timescales; planning; lack of flexibility.
Some habitat is drowning.
Many people not heard of group.
NPFF revision.
Number of stakeholders within some catchments is excessive.
Funding timescales.
Not all stakeholders yes; Riparian Owners; infrastructure providers.
Species migration moving north climate change – mosquito/malaria.
Do Riparian Owners understand their opportunities?

Opportunities

Understanding of Peat!! Climate Change.
RFCC – S&O – SuDS Task & Finish Group.
ELM regardless of the bill.
Peat – carbon – NFM – biodiversity – archaeology.
New CSFP strategy needs to identify what we want to lobby for.
Flow management of critical assets.
Use of natural features to manage water.
Big money comes in flood schemes – maximise environmental delivery.
Environmental Net Gain Policy.
Funding incentives for multiple benefits need change.
Use planning system to stop building on flood “sinks” – planning regulations.
Talking to business re: catchment approach to protect businesses and employees.
Need to share investment opportunities.
Tree planting drone.
More joined up working lobby for changes.
Catchment management plans – wider FRM understanding to enable each riparian owner to know the strategy of their area.
New strategy will allow us to relaunch public knowledge around main players working together.
Align UU drainage area plans to a catchment level.
Severe weather inclusion – benefit realised.
Riparian owner campaign.
Getting ELMs to deliver NFM.
Advancement in tech allowing for greater integration.

Threats

Do we understand integration? No single narrative.
 Stakeholders not given representative value of having stake in the game.
 Lots of stuff to be integrated – across catchments – across different flooding sources – across different organisations – other partnerships & strategies – It's all too big.
 Government policies & practices need to change.
 No national database of Slow the Flow.
 Recognising that flood mitigation may compromise some species.
 Funding streams – government taking flooding seriously.
 People versus wildlife.
 Not many examples in green infrastructure providing flood risk benefit's impact.
 CSFP no planning representation needs to be material to planning law.
 Tension people versus environment.
 Multiple benefits.
 Not getting people on board partly.
 New designation limiting us.
 World Heritage Site status.
 Environmental constraints of estuary management.

Table 4

Facilitator: Stewart Mounsey

CSFP Working Principle No.4: Community–focussed decision-making – sharing information and data with communities, groups and organisations so they can help us to best protect our communities from flooding.

Summary

Strengths – We are in the room; people care and strong relationships
Weaknesses – We didn't always communicate in the right way; data sharing
Opportunities – Shared evidence/modelling (Citizens Science); Joining forces – one voice – greater leverage locally/nationally
Threats – The next flood; we are limited by the governance/organisations/silos

Strengths

Greater working together in recent times (but still improvements can be made).
 Catchment portals – data & what's happening.
 Flood and environment conversations happening.
 Understanding history of catchments.
 Having community reps on the Board.
 Partnership is leading the way.
 Unprecedented what next?
 People care and are engaged.
 We are all(most of us) here?
 Local knowledge.
 Aiming high – getting everyone in the room (still room to tweak and improve).
 Some networking comms reps here.
 Community focussed decision making – working with those communities that have been affected by flooding.

Weaknesses

No RFCC rep. – need independent community rep.
 Moving at pace and engagement.
 Policies/practices at government level.
 Data protection.
 Lack of trust – community left out of some meetings.
 How often do we engage with locals? – not just during projects.

Should we consider those communities not affected by flooding?
 Communication e.g. Pioneer project – other issues.
 “Partnership” – are risk genuinely shared?
 Lack of major funding to protect communities going forward.
 Lack of resources to adequately do this.
 Terminology can be different between designers/communities/RMAs.
 Don’t communicate enough in the right way.
 Competency groups – need listening to.
 Too many initiatives not coordinated – climate – flood recovery – resilience etc.
 Pioneer Project – WLLG group not consulted.

Opportunities

Local feedback on models as they are developed, iterative. Make sure locals recognise model of current situation before using future predictions.
 FLAG engagement.
 Volunteer community – WCMG; engagement; i.e. tree planting.
 Systems for data collection and access.
 Better modelling/understanding risk. Better cost benefit.
 Future Natural Capital baselining to show current state and potential for change.
 What proactive positive communication method can be utilised.
 Co-production model.
 We should be able to join forces and use the combined strengths.
 To find important local information from the community.
 Much broader conversations: - wider environment; public health/social prescriptions.
 To use the local reps to talk to the local people in their language.
 Links with schools/colleges.
 At each level have we got it right? Strategic/tactical/operational.
 Parish Councils etc.
 Build on work so far to involve community specialists to develop initiatives and drive stuff forwards – not wait for RFCC/EA/CCC to do.
 A shared understanding of risk. A Risk Register could be a valuable tool for the CSFP.
 Using shared data to prioritise multiple benefit action.

Threats

Cost benefit analysis doesn’t always equate with communities.
 Too much information – expectation of data sharing.
 Funding.
 Another major event shows failure.
 Lack of value for emotional/ mental health impacts – need to challenge the methodology that this is based on (asking people who live in a flood risk area how much they would pay to avoid flooding – but most haven’t experienced it?).
 Shared understanding of flooding mechanisms.
 Integrating different kinds of “evidence” – they don’t directly compare.
 Not yet flooded – not engaged (yet).
 Model v reality/observation.
 Opinion v competent opinion.
 Expertise – trust; listening to community.
 Limited by governance. Cross-funding.
 Inability to share key data, e.g. infrastructure resilience.
 Communication – what is in the art of the possible.
 How we use the language.
 Local engagement with limited resources.
 Strategic decisions depending on which minister/government.

Table 5

Facilitator: Elizabeth Radford

CSFP Working Principle no. 5: Evolution and learning – using learning from Storm Desmond and the best information available to work closely with communities and identify actions.

Summary

Strengths. CSFP is good. So much flooding we have had to learn.

Callon/s.19 reports/Storyboard/community reports have all helped.

Always learning.

Weaknesses. Wider community reach must include those not flooded and those on flood lists not covered – no involvement from community reps.

Surface water implications. Managing expectations – communities understanding that not everything can be funded.

Opportunities. Climate change agenda – need to understand it because it is fundamental to flooding.

Using a co-produced methodology.

Communications and technology on potential impacts.

Threats. Lack of trust – data/models/experts.

Understanding climate change – always having to adapt changing plans and policies.

Strengths.

Better than before on schemes.

Storyboard to visualise info.

Engagement good. Community involved.

Section 19 report engagement.

Realisation of expertise in community. Callon Report– “pusillanimous”

Systems thinking – sharing experience and resource to deliver better.

Learning from more people than before.

Learning all the time. Open to ideas of others/what has happened elsewhere.

Given the history of the county we have learned from experience. One community every year at least.

Learning events in local areas.

Weaknesses

Community defined as “resilience” when much community are deeply strategic.

Lag in models & future modelling based on IPCC data.

Best information available – what is that? Always changing competing views on data & info.

Lack of trust in experts.

Pitt Report work happening 12 years later. Now out of date. Is Desmond the same?

Surface water monitoring – ignorance. Raise awareness of small actions – permeable opportunities – use the planning system.

Lack of appreciation of other Risk Management Authorities challenges. So difficult to explain to communities.

Reading the wider comment (beyond CRAGG).

Received solutions of few Desmond engagement with not flooded ones.(?)

[Pioneer] toolkits developed without community involvement.

Bigger picture required?

Lack of resources to keep communities engaged.

Lack of £.

Managing expectations – all ideas cannot be funded.

Opportunities.

Use of planning system to impose conditions to reduce flood risk.

Climate change & flooding together.

We have moved/progressed since 2015. We can evolve this and build on the learning to date.

There are always more people to learn from.

Coordinated proactive communications of potential impact.

EA tells us what's wrong; we tell the politicians. They tell the EA.

Better data, models. Change in 'expert power'.

Co-production methodology.

Opportunity through national context to change.

Politicians need to step-up or move aside.

Proper use of surface water hierarchy – communities can lobby it.

Technology is evolving to help us.

Calliac. Desmond IL marks USED (Community Report). (?)

More lobby for surface water issues. Network Rail & Highways.

Threats

Climate change.

Trust in data, models, experts. "community in from the cold" "Stop the blaming".

Governance above is a restriction.

Climate change – not clear for communities. Need better education.

Another major event – we're out on our ears. Trust flooded.

Always having to adapt our learning to ever changing plans/political environment.

Prioritise the development of climate change impacts for Cumbria. Where are our future risks?

Lack of cumulative impact appreciation – in communities, e.g. new drives.

Learning B out there and available to all.

Competing priorities.

EA tied by Defra. Defra tied by Treasury.

Additional points in response to feedback

VS noted that the Partnership Programmes/Project Pipeline work that has been managed by the CMGs need to be reviewed and updated. This was an important tool for effective partnership working and should be continued.

What is the scope for the CSFP to have a budget? AJ responded by highlighting issues that would come with this: -

- Where would it come from? RMAs already direct their financial resources to projects and other interests of the CSFP;
- As CSFP activities develop, could a budget be established for administration purposes?
- There would be collective governance issues; i.e. could the CSFP become a limited company?

Our Partnership

RD presented his first impressions of the day and of the CSFP and gave a presentation intended to stimulate comment on the current health of the CSFP and scope for improvement and development.

His presentation started with a plan of the Penrith Road scheme in Keswick where he had been present for a site visit 2 days before. Prompted by the name of 'Springfield' where the new attenuation pond was under construction, he had asked himself whether it was not likely that originally there had been perhaps ten or more ponds on the slope, subsequently filled in to make way for the 20th century housing development below. Early maps and even photographs would probably contain some of the answers. Such documents are important, and in his view there can be a false dichotomy between historical and current data. Citing examples of major floods from 17th to 20th centuries, he said that occasional massive rainfall episodes had always happened in Cumbria and will continue to do so.

He then summarised some key points from a July 2019 Rockefeller Foundation report: "Combined voices can have credence - Derived from the RF 100 Resilient Cities Program".

Floods have greater consequences than any other type of natural hazard. Over 734 million people globally have been affected since 2009, with negative impacts on individual livelihoods and as a critical challenge to cities and countries in achieving their development objectives. It was found that having access to accurate and pragmatic information is crucial to proactive planning, community and stakeholder involvement, the selection of appropriate strategic interventions, and building flood resilience. It was also found that the most successful partnership engagements define and articulate their challenge and objective; ensure clear scope of work and defined expectations; prepare carefully; leverage local knowledge; and promote cross-departmental /-organisational collaboration. But even the best-laid plans required partners who were flexible and patient with timelines.

He looked forward to the recorded outputs from today's event and the challenges of developing the CSFP Strategy. He noted with particular interest the honesty of the comments made on mental health issues from so many people present and CSFP has to take this forward. He thanked everyone for the kind and supportive welcome he had received.

AJ thanked everyone for a very productive day, noting her role as Interim Chair had been interesting and challenging. She will have less involvement in CSFP in the future. The meeting acknowledged her many contributions.