

	to renovate the Barmouth viaduct. The question was raised as to whether Network Rail had considered where they may move the line to in-land, as time goes on? This can be raised by Working Group members at the forthcoming Project Board Meeting, where NR will have a presence.		
6	<p>Frequently Asked Questions: Questions raised at the public event on 22.01.16 have now been added to the FAQ document and are largely answered by the relevant respondent. FFC are yet to forward their own questions from their public event and would like to categorise these prior to sending over.</p> <p>The matter of simplifying the document was discussed and PP presented a spreadsheet of how this could be done. PP said he would welcome some support to do this and LM offered the services of her colleague, Hefin Lloyd Wright, who was familiar with the project and who had the skills to support this task. LM committed to discuss with HLW and ask him to contact PP to move this task forward.</p>	LM	Next Meeting
7	<p>Next Public Event: Feedback is that the event and presentations were well-received and attendants were glad that we made the time to hold the event. However, comments were also made as to the fact they felt that nothing had changed and there was nothing new to tell them. LM eluded to the same comments which had been made in the earlier Masterplanning Meeting and reminded those present that the 'change' that residents are looking for in terms of house values/sales and choices, would take longer to observe and that the work we were doing in the project was actually contributing to the 'changes' residents were hoping for.</p> <p>All present concurred with this and acknowledged that the project had indeed made a great deal of progress and perhaps we needed to reinforce the successes further with the community and reiterate to them that the work we are doing contributes to the 'changes' they want to see.</p>		
8	<p>Friog Cliff Study</p> <p>Minor works would commence in Autumn 2016. Some members of the group asked how much would these works cost and LP committed to find out and revert accordingly. LP reiterated that the current standard of protection would withstand a one in 200 year event.</p>	LP	Next Meeting
9	<p>Any Other Business</p> <p>Reporting of incidents: LM stated she would produce a list of contacts who residents could contact 'in the event of.....'. FFC offered to</p>	LM	ASAP

	<p>circulate this with their newsletter and it could also go onto the www.fairbourne.info website.</p> <p>Coastal Fund: SS mentioned the opportunity of securing further funding through the Coastal Fund. SS to investigate further and report back.</p> <p>Request for Data: PC stated that FFC had met with Professor Mike Phillips from the University of Wales (Swansea), who had made contact with FFC in view of the situation with the village. Professor Phillips and his team had offered to re-model the data collected from beach profiling, shingle bank and ground water monitoring, to see if they came up with similar results. Discussion between HD and PC ensued and it was decided that data could be released for this purpose and PC was to report on the outcome at the relevant Working Group meeting.</p> <p>Risk Register: The risk register for the project was produced by the group – a copy of this can be made available upon request. It should be noted that this is a register of risks affecting the running of the project and not risks relating to Fairbourne itself.</p>	<p>SS</p> <p>HD</p>	<p>Next meeting</p> <p>Next Meeting</p>
10	<p>Dates of forthcoming Working Group Meetings:</p> <p>Tuesday 22nd March 2106, 11.30am, AVH</p>		