



MEETING MINUTES			
Meeting Name	Theddlethorpe GDF Working Group – Meeting 1		
Meeting Date	21.10.2021	Meeting Time	11.00 – 13.00
Type of Meeting	Phone Call <input type="checkbox"/> Virtual/ Conference Meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> In Person <input type="checkbox"/>		
Location	MS Teams		
Attendees			
Independent Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Jon Collins (JC)		
Independent Facilitator	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Victoria McCusker (VM)		
Lincolnshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cllr Martin Hill (MH), LeaderAndy Gutherson (AG), Executive Director of Place		
East Lindsey CC Leader (Observers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Cllr Craig Leyland (CL), LeaderMichelle Sacks (MS), East Lindsey Deputy Chief Executive (Growth)		
Theddlethorpe All saints St Helen's Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Mr Carl Richardson (CR), Chair		
RWM	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Sam King (SK), Head of Community Engagement & Site EvaluationCraig Taylor (CT), Head of Regional CommunicationsKate Atha (KA), Community Engagement ManagerKieran Somers (KS), Site Evaluation ManagerMichelle Bailes (MB), Secretariat		
Independent Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Dr Robin Kimber (RK) and Anne Milburn (AM), TraverseSerife Gunal, Traverse (Apologies)		



Item	Discussion	Actions	Lead	Target Completion Date
1	Introductions Chair asked all attendees to provide brief introduction to themselves and roles			
2	Terms of Reference 2.1 MH requested that para 9.7 be amended to remove the word chair . It wasn't thought appropriate that communications from WG members had to be agreed by the chair. All WG members were in agreement on this. 2.2 CL proposed that all WG meetings should ensure items requiring external communication are highlighted and discussed.	Agreed – RWM to amend para 9.7 of the ToR in accordance with the WG request. Craig Taylor to ensure an item on Communications is added as a regular agenda item for the WG meetings with any items for communication attached to the agenda.	Kate Atha Craig Taylor	31/10/21
3	Conflict of Interest declarations 3.1 AG asked what the mechanism was in terms receipt of forms and collation and communication of any declarations of conflicts of interest. KA explained that the form appended to the ToR should be completed (if required) and forwarded to her.	Note and action: KA to circulate the communication form to the WG members.	Kate Atha	31/10/21



<p>4</p>	<p>Working Group – Objectives and Programme</p> <p>4.1 WG asked for clarity on how many eligible votes per organisation. SK explained that there was one vote per WG member with the chair having a casting vote.</p> <p>4.2 SK explained the 3 key objectives for the WG and the associated work streams with key milestones to achieve over the next 6 months.</p> <p>4.3 KS added that, regarding the key aspect of suitable geology, there were large amounts of borehole and seismic data available in and around the Theddlethorpe area, including the area off the coast and RWM were intending to purchase this data during the WG phase. RWM would then analyse this data and considered that that sufficient information could be available by spring 2022 to enable the identification of provisional locations for investigation boreholes. RWM also intend to commission further seismic surveys and would be applying for the associated marine licences during 2022.</p> <p>4.4 MH highlighted that one of the key concerns from the local community was the level of uncertainty and the timing associated with the GDF process and all efforts should be made to improve clarity and transparency.</p> <p>4.5 Exhibitions – WG members raised concerns with venues for exhibitions and mechanisms for choosing locations. Potential gaps felt to be North Summercotes, Alford and possibly others.</p> <p>4.6 WG members requested that there should be a formal log of any community issues raised</p> <p>4.7 MS described some of the good practice on community engagements on recent large infrastructure projects in the Boston area, including on how to cater for hard to reach groups. It was agreed to share lessons learnt etc with RWM</p> <p>4.8 WG members queried how information would be shared with the group in between meetings.</p>	<p>RWM to review current venues and propose additional venues and timings.</p> <p>RWM to provide information to WG on process RWM use for logging and responding to queries and to ensure that WG have visibility of all queries coming in.</p> <p>Kate Atha to liaise with MS on lessons learnt.</p> <p>Kate Atha to propose mechanism for sharing of information and distribution and welcomed any further suggestions from WG members.</p>	<p>Kate Atha</p> <p>Kate Atha</p> <p>Kate Atha</p> <p>Kate Atha</p>	<p>31/10/21</p> <p>31/10/21</p> <p>31/10/21</p> <p>31/10/21</p>
----------	---	---	---	---



Item	Discussion	Actions	Lead	Target Completion Date
5	<p>Search Area process</p> <p>5.1 KS described the proposed process for identification of the Search Area and how this related to the identification of Community Partnership members and allocation of community funding. KS also described the difference between the Search Area and the Potential Host Community within which the Test of Public Support would be held.</p> <p>5.2 KS went on to explain the nature of the Search Area workshop and the two step process considering firstly geological and then environmental , transport and engineering feasibility considerations. Proposed date for the Workshop was during week of 16th November.</p> <p>5.3 WG members raised the issue that it was very important to give absolute clarity to the local community regarding the difference between the Search Area and the Potential Host Community and the associated implications.</p>	<p>Kieran Somers to liaise with WG members regarding attendance at the Search Area Identification Workshop.</p>	<p>Kieran Somers</p>	<p>31/10/21</p>
6	<p>Stakeholder Group proposal</p> <p>6.1 KA summarised the key points within the Stakeholder Group proposal paper. It was discussed that the members of the Stakeholder Group could also potentially be members of the Community Partnership. It was agreed that each WG member would consider the organisations put forward and respond with any comments and/or any further proposed organisations by 25/10/21</p>	<p>Kate Atha to collate responses and prepare invitations to prospective members of the Stakeholder Group</p>	<p>Kate Atha</p>	<p>26/10/21</p>
7	<p>Independent evaluation of Working Group activity</p> <p>7.1 RK described the role of Traverse as the Independent Evaluator and their role of monitoring to ensure that best practice was used in the WG process and all associated community engagement activity.</p> <p>7.2 MH – asked about the reporting process and as to what information could be shared publicly.</p> <p>7.3 RK clarified the reporting mechanisms and how reports would be distributed.</p> <p>7.4 TM introduced herself as the facilitator – and that she would provide support in development of consensus in the WG outcomes, establishing trust and that every member was able to contribute in the way they wanted/needed to</p>			



Item	Discussion	Actions	Lead	Target Completion Date
8	Key activities in next month 8.1 KS explained the key activities in the next month leading up to the next working group meeting and the principle of carrying out the activities outside of the working group via various workstream groups, with appropriate representation/experts from each member organisation, that would report back into the Working Group. There was consensus that this was an appropriate delivery approach for the WG.			
9	AOB 9.1 One query was raised with regard to consideration of legal challenge for any relevant documents/decisions and making sure the WG were aware of any circumstance where this may be relevant			
10	Future meeting dates 10.1 The dates for the future WG meetings were shared and agreed	Agreed dates to be shared	Kate Atha	w/c 25/10/21



Working in Partnership **OFFICIAL**

Theddlethorpe