

Morvern Deer Management Group

Minutes from Meeting Held at Lochaline Village Hall 31st October 2018

PL introduced the meeting

Members were told that the meeting would be recorded and that Angus Davidson was taking the minutes

Community bodies have been invited to the meeting and the meeting has been advertised to welcome members of the public

PL described the challenges the group is facing with changes in land management objectives at Ardtornish and with the number of designated sites within the group area. AD displayed Maps of designated sites which had produced in Morvern area to clearly show site conditions and where over-grazing pressures were creating negative impacts

PL Stated that he viewed it as the remit of the group to cooperate between land holdings to deliver differing objectives yet ensure that the SSSI / SAC designated sites are protected

PL said he had spoken with Hugh Raven who had affirmed the Ardtornish commitment to cull 30 stags and 170 hinds until there was population modelling and count evidence to support a change from these figures

PL asked all attendees to introduce themselves and specify which land holding or organisation their views represent

Attendees

Peter Lawson (Kinlochteacuis-Chair)

Faith Raven (Ardtornish)

Simon Boulton (Ardtornish)

Alan Kennedy (Ardtornish)

Ian Collier (Forestry Commission Scotland)

Torquil Kennedy (Forest Enterprise Scotland)

John Jackson (Forest Enterprise Scotland)

Alasdair Firth (Morvern Community Woodland)

Mark Foxwell (Scottish Wildlife Trust)

Susan Larson (Kingairloch)

Rob Lintott (Kingairloch)

Iain Thornber (Glensanda)

Neil Roberts (Laudale)

John MacDonald (Drimnin/Killundine)

Lorraine Servant (Scottish Natural Heritage)

Douglas Weir (Morvern Community Trust)

Lynda Campbell (ADMG)

Stephen Fox (Carnoch & ELSDMG)

Derek Lewis (Drimnin)

Angus Davidson (Consultant)

Apologies

Bill Rosier (Rahoy), **Jamie Cameron** (Kilmalieu), **Matthew Wilson** (Oronsay) and **Jim Bolton** (Morvern Community Council).

I.	Matters Arising from Previous Minutes	Actions
1.1.	Iain Thorber (IT) corrected item number three, he did not witness 30-40 animals' dead, this was an estimated mortality rate judging by numbers. He also noted that his stated cull of ten stags will be shootable beasts. This has been amended.	
1.2.	IT asked about Scottish Wildlife Trust (SWT) mortality figures, Mark Foxwell (MF) had spoken to Steven and there had been no deaths noted.	
1.3.	IT asked about requested helicopter count flight path data from Graeme Taylor, this has not been returned, Lorraine Servant (LS) will chase up.	LS
1.4.	IT asked about scientific justification for further culling on Rahoy, MF said there was justification and noted legal right to cull due to conservation purposes. IT disagreed to which. MF questioned who at Glensanda had expressed the concern over culling on the Reserve. Peter Lawson (PL) noted this has been discussed at previous meetings and concluded this is an issue to be discussed between SWT and Kinlochteacuis.	IT, MF
2.	Individual Estates Reporting	Actions
2.1.	<p>John Macdonald (JM) reported Drimnin cull figures as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 open hill stags • 23 in forestry • 5 out of season stags • 7 roebuck in woodland, in season <p>Average age on open hill was calculated at 7 ½ years, clean larder weight was 75kg (13.8 stone). Open hill deer have been at best average condition, believed to have never recovered from difficult winter, dry summer and wet Autumn. JM noted that it was the worst season for weather in living memory, making culling very difficult. Hind numbers are reasonable but there has been a lot of small calves and there is expected mortality which will be taken into consideration on cull figures. No poaching activity.</p> <p>Derek Lewis (DL) reported that there was no notable habitat impact. 40ha has been planted earlier this year and woodland surveys are in process, focusing on designated sites. Further action on restoring designated sites will likely include additional tree planting. This will be going out to public consultation before the end of the year.</p>	
2.2.	<p>JM reported Killundine culling as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 open hill stags - 7 stags in enclosed woodland plus 2 roebuck <p>Average age 7 ½ years and weight slightly higher at 85 kg (17.1 stone) – one particularly heavy at 26.4 stone. Difference to Drimnin due to pine-based woodland stags, overall condition was fantastic. Rut was late and deer were difficult to find in early part of season. Hind cull figures will also consider small calves and mortality.</p> <p>No information on public interest as management is currently static. Noted that audit has been completed, John to check and ensure this is sent to Angus Davidson (AD).</p>	JM
2.3.	<p>Torquil Kennedy (TK) reported the following cull for FCS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 46 stags • 11 Roebuck • 16 hinds and 18 calves <p>Condition of animals is good/unchanged, proposed hind cull is similar to last year (50-60). Regeneration is present throughout and public interest matters are status quo.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steven Fox (SF) requested at this point that skills and training log could be passed around for all members to fill out. 	
2.4.	Neil Roberts (NR) reported Laudale culling figures as 47 stags. Average age down to approx. 7yrs and weight 14 stone. Noted major difficulty in finding mature stags and culling	NR

	<p>these would have left high concentration of young. Agreed most difficult rut, animals not in excellent condition but nothing too concerning. No poaching activity. Proposed hind cull of 40-50.</p> <p>Best practice habitat monitoring is being completed in SSSI, but no time to do elsewhere – NR to return this data to AD.</p>	
2.5.	<p>IT reported Glensanda culling as: 8 stags of average age 8, no weights as broken scales, waiting on larder weights from butcher. Proposed hind cull of 25 but will adapt as noted high mortality.</p> <p>No public interest activity as such, habitat monitoring information is pending from a consultant but plots have been established – this information to be returned to SF or AD when obtained.</p>	IT
2.6.	<p>Rob Lintott (RL) reported Kingairloch cull figures as 32 stags including one in enclosed woodland, split was 11 in south and 20 in north. Average age of 8 and 82kg larder weight. Agreed that stags were thin on the ground in early season but shot stags in good condition. No poaching activity. Proposed hind cull of around 55. Habitat monitoring will be using same plots and information and will be fed to AD.</p> <p>Susan Larson (SL) illustrated public interest; four staff have been put through spraying training and two through sit-in ATV (argo) course. Finishing the hydro has given easier access to hill for deer extraction and walking. Hill walkers have been discouraged through the season, though many have ignored signs.</p>	
2.7.	<p>SF reported that in Carnoch there were 12 stags shot, 4 of which were truly on open hill and the rest in woodland. Condition was fairly good, but heads were not as heavy as previously. Agreed that there wasn't so many to be seen on ground. No poaching activity. Weight not summarised but is on return sheets. SF using guidance from this meeting to determine hind cull, more hinds are present due to opening woodland – on this basis 15-20 culled plus calves.</p> <p>Discussion with Iain Collier (IC) took place re input planting, working with agent but has gone quiet, will chase. Planting will only include small areas of infill in what was existing woodland so should not have negative effects.</p> <p>Habitat monitoring has been completed and input on SNH spreadsheet. Summarised data showed generally light to moderate impact with 6% of plots heavy pressure. Heather presence 93% and light to moderate trampling. Data to be sent to AD.</p>	SF
2.8.	<p>PL reported Kinlochteacus figures. 7 stags shot in good condition, largest stag 18 stone. Noted more than usual with broken antlers. Also agreed on late rut and shortage of stags until end of season and no poaching activity. Proposed hind cull of 10-15 plus 10 on SWT</p> <p>Public interest included 3 sit-in and sit-astride ATV training plus an additional trained hunter guest. Deer management in collaboration with SWT. Peatland survey completed and working towards farm environmental plan including woodland grazing, moorland management, peatland restoration, ancient woodland management and salt marsh management. Ongoing eradication of ragwort and Japanese knotweed, both under control. No rhododendron but supporting eradication on access to Carna. Heightened awareness to guests on Lymes disease and no RTA's.</p>	
2.9.	<p>SL passed on that Bill Rosier listed 24 stags and one roebuck shot on Rahoy.</p>	
2.10.	<p>Morvern Community Woodland: There has been nothing shot for years due to neighbouring FCS. Noted Chalara effect on ash has been bad and other species will be required to regenerate.</p>	

	Other	
2.11.	SF questioned promotion of Peatland Restoration. Alan Kennedy (AK) noted one completed site and two ongoing on Ardtornish. Lorraine Servant (LS) noted there will be funding available and Peatland Action website is very informative. PL mentioned incorrect applications will not be amended, LS responded that application is light touch and peatland funding easier to obtain in comparison to others.	
2.12.	SF questioned if trying not to shoot calves was a sensible suggestion. NR commented lots of poor calves on west of Laudale, has seen strong ones but generally shooting yield hinds. It was agreed amongst several members that hinds were less present during rut, less held by stags than usual. IT noted that hinds have been in such poor condition there is suggestion they will be rejected by game dealer.	
2.13.	It was identified within the group there was one RTA in which a stag was killed on the road.	
3.	Ardtornish Report and Long Term Forestry Plan	Actions
3.1.	<p>Simon Boulton (SB) reported there were 27 open hill stags shot plus 2 enclosed on Ardtornish. Condition was not bad, average weight 15 stone and average age 10. Also agreed on difficult rut.</p> <p>AK stated whole estate habitat monitoring was done in 2017 and sent to Angus but more is planned. Woodland will probably be done in coming winter and Upland next year or 2020, aiming for 3-5 year interval. Around 160 plots overall and programme to update these over coming years.</p> <p>Ardtornish is in year 1 of the reduction cull. At present there is over 1,100, recognised from 2018 helicopter count and 2016 walk-over. Ambiguity between breakdown of stags and hinds. Working towards a population of 300 stags and 300 hinds to reduce from 8 deer per km² to just under 5 deer per km² – aiming to achieve by 2021. Cull has been split between east and west, population figures have gone up from original aim of 3-4 per km².</p> <p>Phase 1 new native woodland planning is ¾ of the way through, the end of the year (or start of next) will see an additional 198 ha enclosed, 128 of which will be planted. There is consultation of phase two for next year, a further 667 ha will be enclosed of which 200 ha will be new planting and 100ha of existing woodland will be protected for regeneration.</p> <p>The farm is also trying to reduce grazing impact from sheep numbers. 2 hirsels and those on the SWT Reserve have been cleared, some have also been enclosed in hill park. Phase one could be considered as complete, further reductions will likely take place in future but no timescales as of yet. Also reducing cattle numbers to improve riparian habitats, 90 cows now wintering in East Lothian and 30 breeding cows have been sold. Also likely to be reduced in future, but currently recruiting new farm manager before progressing.</p>	
3.2.	<p>AK discussed responsibility of legacy woodland and designated sites, long term forestry plan (LTFP) underway and looking at funding options. Assessments of the impact of sheep removal are being undertaken as well as habitat monitoring, bird surveys and insect monitoring. The started program of monitoring should see changes due to deer density</p> <p>PL raised the possibility of re-fencing of designated woodland sites. AK believes it's unfeasible to reinstate ring fence and may look at compartmentalising and enclosing areas within. AK detailed that fencing will depend on grant funding which will depend on the LTFP. PL noted that discussion with other member's favoured fencing and questioned likely fenced acreage. AK determined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently 762ha of tight fence, another 667ha will be added. • 600ha or so of porous fencing which needs addressed but again will depend on funding. <p>AK concluded that fencing cannot be determined until LTFP completed and funding applied</p>	

	for, though noted Ardtornish cannot privately fund. IT and possibly others agreed they would support. AK stated they are working on repairs though fences are under pressure, it is not in their interest to shoot further increased numbers so fencing will be the preferable option.	
3.3.	DL asked about feedback on public consultation, AK stated Hugh is dealing with this so he cannot answer but believes there has been positive response. It was agreed that feedback on responses is in the public interest. Several members also agreed that it was difficult to answer consultation questions having only seen the strategy document not the full report. PL determined a publication giving a summary of responses and Ardtornish' action plans would be most suitable. AK will speak to Hugh Raven regarding this and feedback to the group.	AK
3.4.	PL mentioned a lack of updated Ardtornish deer management plan, AK expressed this will be included in LTFP. PL queried how the group feel that cull figures are being given after cull has begun. SL expressed concern over importance of collaborating between estates and the not having information about effects on Kingairloch, (which wishes to remain sporting). PL expressed that Rory Putman (RP) will not complete population model until appropriate data has been sent, this should hopefully be completed before 2019 stag season. PL echoed RP's comment that cull numbers allow for export which should mitigate affects. SL expressed further concern over sub-group split and culling numbers in Ardtornish south. SB expressed he this must be determined by Raven family as he is only doing as instructed. PL concluded that sub-group meeting would be appropriate for this.	AK, SB, SL
3.5.	LS queried timescale of LTFP, IC determined only a few verifications required and should be on public register in a couple of weeks.	
3.6.	Overall agreement on importance of obtaining data for RP's population model. PL noted members in open hill range have agreed jointly fund, LS confirmed SNH will try to obtain data for those that don't participate in group.	LS
4.	Hill Sheep	Actions
4.1.	SL noted the difficulty with Ardtornish sheep on Kingairloch and problems during stalking. IT also mentioned issues at Glensanda. Alan apologised and will endeavour to solve this.	AK
4.2.	PL discussed sheep reduction map to be created by Angus and current holes in data. SL will ask Jamie Cameron for Kilmaleau data.	SL
5.	Proposed Deer Count 2019	Actions
5.1.	SB and NR to organise count, determined likely in March/any time after the hind season ending. PL requested to be kept in the loop. SB noted it will likely be short notice as it can't be determined far in advance.	SB/NR
5.2.	IT questioned requirement of count and accuracy of previous of count. LS noted there is no reason count figures should not be accurate. Agreement from group that spring count is important to see impact of changes at Ardtornish. Further liaising will determine who will assist with counts.	
5.3.	Members discussed importance of recruitment counts, agreement that full deer counts February/March and sample recruitment count to be completed later on, perhaps May.	
5.4.	SF questioned mortality counts. LS will seek more advice from SNH about this as methodology complicated, but reiterated importance of recruitment counts.	LS

6.	Habitat Monitoring Information	Actions
6.1.	AD noted; Kinlochteacus, Forestry Commission and Ardtornish data obtained, if further members can share data this would be helpful for progressing with summary maps. VC highlighted as important for future assessments.	ALL
6.2.	<p>LS commented there is need for more woodland habitat monitoring.</p> <p>PL asked about training from SNH, LS stated no budget for this. Alistair Firth (AF) said there may be funding obtainable, if group were happy to be involved in a trial of sorts – will further investigate options.</p> <p>SF emphasised this will be easier if there is a simpler methodology. Agreed that methodology is complicated, feedback should be given to SNH and training would be useful.</p>	AF
6.3.	<p>PL determined need to set targets across group for impact on designated sites.</p> <p>AD expresses that once baseline data is summarised group should set targets, which may vary between members. Maps show some woodland designated sites are unfavourable.</p> <p>LS summarised woodland features condition; Morvern Woodlands SAC is primarily on Ardtornish, all unfavourable but should improve in reduction of deer numbers, Sunart SAC also unfavourable.</p> <p>On Ben ladain species rich grassland main concern, recent 2015 study of erosion showed feature is in unfavourable condition. PL confirmed sheep have been removed from this area which should have impact.</p> <p>LS confirmed SNH is not concerned how deer population model is completed, but it will be used to assess how deer will impact Rahoy Hills and coastal woodland.</p> <p>LS concluded; reduce herbivore impacts on protected areas dependant on habitat. Deer should be reduced to around 10 deer per km² in species rich grassland and lower in woodlands. How monitoring will be carried out ongoing will depend on funding, as previous it expensive. Member's monitoring will feed into this. Appropriate population on non-designated ground can be determined once AD has gathered further habitat data.</p>	
7.	Economic Aspects	Actions
7.1.	PL requested all members feed-back summary of economic information to AD so this can be included in his part of spring review.	ALL
7.2.	SF noted VC had simple method of summarising this. Asked that SF sends this on.	SF
8.	Sub-population Areas	Actions
8.1.	<p>Sub-population areas drafted from previous meetings, agreed that RP's tweaks will be allowed. SL requested splitting north and east of Ardtornish figures, PL suggested she should discuss further with Rory.</p> <p>Agreed that Glencripesdale information is important. LS will take further measures to try to obtain. LS will check for SNH Glencripesdale position on this.</p> <p>PL expressed that enclosed properties can give their own models which will be attached to open hill model, or pay in and feed data to Rory to be included. JM expressed he will complete for Killundine and Drimnin then pass onto Rory.</p> <p>NR commented that those on the ground should be able to decide certain aspects of population modelling for themselves, also agrees with subgroup division. PL thinks population model is good exercise to be carried out and built on, but will need periodic review and</p>	SL, LS

	updating.	
9.	Association for Deer Management Groups	
9.1.	<p>PL asked Richard Cooke to attend to speak about ADMG role, Linda Campbell (LC) is representing.</p> <p>LC summarised that the role is representation at EU, UK, Scottish Parliament and local authority level on all matter relating to the management of deer. They regularly liaise with government organisations and NGO's such as John Muir Trust. Trying to coordinate and give guidance in relation to wild deer. Has input on factors such as best practice guidance and methodology such as habitat monitoring, promoting training of deer managers and coordinated approach to marketing of wild venison, such as Scottish Wild Venison Partnership. Publications and delivery of newsletters. Overall main function is to represent and give a lead to deer management groups in the voluntary approach to deer management that recognises all interests. This should help to raise the bar in group performance in relation to what Scottish government and SNH are expecting. ADMG also assists with funding of health check assessments and the ongoing progress of collaborative deer management. Trying to portray the sector as a well-structured and progressive land-use sector to the government and the general public, which relates well to other land uses and provides positive public interest.</p> <p>LC discussed appeals on sporting rates and it was mentioned by some members that they have had generic feedback on appeals, but main appeal meeting date is still set as 4th of December. ADMG to circulate Scottish Land and Estates guidance document.</p>	LC
9.2.	<p>PL discussed feedback on deer group organisation; concern over level of fee paid to ADMG. Noted that the notice period for ADMG meetings was short and may be easier at beginning or end of week for those travelling far, rather than a Wednesday. LC expressed that meeting timetable will be updated in the near future.</p> <p>DL articulated there is no evidence of impact of ADMG relevant to funding being paid. LC responded that this is not an easy aspect to measure.</p> <p>PL questioned overall revenue of ADMG, LC said this will be circulated at AGM, and there is also a budget document which can be viewed. Concluded that more feedback of what is being achieved from ADMG may be beneficial.</p> <p>LC stated, her role is entirely voluntary. Richard Cooke and Finlay Clarke are officials, but all others are voluntary. PL summarises that group are generally happy but there are background concerns and it is important these are fed back.</p>	LC
9.3.	<p>Discussion of subscription fee at £4/stag £2/hind and £1/other. PL asked if non-members are paid for. LC stated that if member drops out group will be liable, but if non-member still provides information this will not be paid for if this is not submitted within cull figures returned to Bidwells. PL determined non-members will not be included going forward. SL to check what has been declared.</p>	SL
10.	Forestry Commission Scotland	
10.1.	<p>PL questioned if there is compensatory cull for Beach plantation in Ardtornish LTFP. AK stated it was not that focused but there was within the approval of planting – it is irrelevant as will be included within overall deer reduction.</p>	
10.2.	<p>SL concerned about compensatory cull. PL suggests this should be further discussed at a sub-area meeting.</p>	
11.	2019 Spring Review	
11.1.	<p>LS explained 35 priorities agreed spread across public interest targets such as designated sites, woodland expansion, group functioning, communication.</p>	

	<p>PL questioned if there was a change and if assessment would be on performance of deer management plan, LS confirmed this will be assessed also, there is an expectation that groups would have improved.</p> <p>LS stated that groups should focus on priority areas. Feedback will be given after this meeting and SNH will give feedback following the review.</p>	
11.2.	<p>PL previously asked SNH to review group members dropping out due to cost. LS stated as long as groups are doing what they can, members dropping out is out with group control, and providing meetings are being opened and advertised appropriately. LS stated member drop-out will not be assessed but rather what the efforts the group have made to get all involved.</p> <p>DL asked what sanctions can SNH impose on those not participating, LS stated under section 40 of deer act information that is needed can be requested. Only planned culls for following year can be requested, there is 36 days to return this information once requested.</p> <p>There's general agreement that it is more difficult for members that choose to participate and they are more heavily scrutinised, this is a disincentive. LS confirmed this has been recognised by SNH.</p> <p>LS confirmed it is a sanction of SNH that landholdings not participating in DMG and part of strategic plan may have SNH and FCS funding withheld.</p>	
	12. Future Meetings	
12.1.	<p>PL discusses tradition of holding meetings in member's houses, and having one meeting per year in village hall.</p> <p>IT suggests group should be meeting in mutual place that does not allow for fear or favour, noted that this may be reason for repeated non-appearance of members. Public place would allow for more public participation. AK agrees that it should seem open to public so at least one meeting per year should be held publicly. DL strongly endorses holding all meetings publicly. IT suggested considering Strontian or Ardgour halls, PL responded it makes sense to hold meeting within deer group area. SL desires one meeting in public place, not concerned for second meeting.</p> <p>PL commended all members for previous hospitality of hosting deer group meetings.</p> <p>General agreement that at least one meeting in public place and making meetings as open as possible. The next meeting will be held in Lochaline Village Hall.</p>	
	13. Subscriptions	
13.1.	<p>There was slight confusion around current subscription fees, PL confirmed last year was £150 admin fee per member and £100 extra levy for open hill members, which was later corrected to £150 additional levy. Kilmaleau and Carna have dropped off subscription due to the additional cost and there is word that Oronsay may also.</p> <p>PL expressed that the group needs to levy approximately an additional £4000 to run the group for the year (on top of ADMG subscription, totalling £1900).</p> <p>PL determines costs for Rory may be around £2000 for population model, dependant on how much time it takes to carry out work.</p> <p>PL asked for approval from the group that Angus is engaged for the following year at a rate of £1800. PL expresses the costs saved on collating information and paying a secretary by having Angus. It is agreed that his work is an important asset to the group.</p> <p>AK; proposal to increase headage payment to cover additional costs, to £5/hind or stag £2/calf and £1/other. AK to calculate this based on previous years cull, it is likely to produce</p>	AK, Open Range Members

	<p>more than £4000 but this may later be required, and it can be adjusted if too much surplus in future. PL declared this should allow for the additional levy to be lowered back to £100 for open hill members. Concluded that treasurer should come to next meeting with proposal.</p> <p>PL confirmed there is £2,500 in the pot going into next year.</p> <p>PL suggests non-member associates should pay £50 flat rate sub, for properties less than 500ha that have no let stalking or principle activity is agriculture. DL then proposed that these are still members but just pay a reduced rate.</p> <p>It was finally agreed that if a property shoots under ten deer per annum there is a £50 group fee plus headage payments, for membership. The remaining members have the original £150 fee plus headage payments.</p> <p>Headage fee shall remain at £4/stag, £2/hind and calf, £1/other</p> <p>It was agreed that open range members should meet separately to discuss an additional levy to fund Rory Putman's population model.</p>	
	14. Any Other Business	
14.1.	PL expressed there will likely be request for more information going forward due to the spring 2019 review. Though some of this may be duplicate material it is important the group are timely in sending through to speed up the information collating process.	
14.2.	DL recognised the voluntary work done by the group office bearers and suggested there should be support from the group for funded help if this is an unreasonable workload. PL responded that the help from Angus Davidson has been of great use, and it should be taken as read that the office bearers have approved Angus to be engaged in the year going forward.	
14.3.	AD highlighted that it is a difficult time for deer groups going forward and with the work involved in the spring review it may be problematic trying to carry out the necessary work at a minimal fee. It was also highlighted that most other groups are funding many more paid hours such as secretaries.	
14.4.	<p>PL declared that it is not currently possible to project the next years cost, though there is available reserve and there may need to be an additional levy in the spring if further admin support is required.</p> <p>PL suggested Ardtornish may wish to pay an additional fee due to the size of the property. AK suggests that Rory's costs should be calculated first.</p> <p>SL commented that the group would benefit from a professional secretary. PL suggested that Angus' fees should possibly be raised going forward.</p>	
14.5.	DL suggested that for public relations the group should ask for a slot at Morvern community council meetings annually to discuss the work of the deer group and raise the profile. AK suggested that presence at the meetings would be a good idea whether this is asked for by the community council or offered by the group. DL noted that council meetings are the first Monday of each month.	
14.6.	<p>Date of next meeting: 23rd April 2019</p> <p>Possible dates for future meetings: 31st October 2019 and 15th April 2020</p>	

SUB POPULATION DISCUSSION Re BE-ACH AREA

After the main meeting a sub population discussion took place with SL +RL representing Kingairloch and AK +SB representing Ardtornish. AD and PL also present.

Concern expressed by Kingairloch over the increased level of culling near Kingairloch march and in particular around the new exclosure at Beach

SB expressed that Ardtornish has made a big concession by restricting stag cull to 30 and that the hinds culled will be off the 170 total identified for the entire estate.

PL suggested that while the objectives of the estates are different it is important that each knows what the other is doing as the season progresses. It was agreed that Ardtornish would share their cull locations with Kingairloch and likewise Kingairloch would share their culling information in the Beach area with Ardtornish.

After the meeting PL spoke to NR of Laudale and they are to be included in the data sharing