

Melgarve Cluster Project

Marine Directorate – Science Evidence Data and Digital (MD-SEDD) – EIA Checklist

| MD-SEDD Standard EIA Report Requirements | Provided in application YES/NO | If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report | If not provided or provided different to MSS advice, please set out reasons. |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p>1. A map outlining the proposed development area and the proposed location of: the towers/poles, permanent and temporary access tracks, including watercourse crossings; buildings including substations; permanent and temporary construction compounds; all watercourses; and contour lines.</p> | Yes | See Chapter 3 - The Proposed Development for details and associated Figure 3.1 for Proposed Development layout. | |
| <p>2. A description and results of the site characterisation surveys for fish (including fully quantitative electrofishing surveys) and water quality including the location of the electrofishing and fish habitat survey sites and water quality sampling sites on the map outlining the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>This should be carried out where a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is present and where salmon are a qualifying feature, and in exceptional cases when required in the scoping advice for other reasons. In other cases, developers can assume that fish populations are present</p> | No | | <p>New fisheries surveys were not carried out specifically for the Proposed Development as it was considered there was sufficient desk-based information available from other sources, in particular the fisheries surveys undertaken for adjoining wind farm schemes on the same areas/watercourses, to accurately characterise the site with respect to fisheries. The site is known to be inaccessible to migratory salmonids, with site watercourses either fishless or containing variable densities of resident brown trout only. This is fully described in Chapter 8 - Ecology.</p> <p>Similarly, there is water quality and classification data published by SEPA which is presented in the baseline hydrology assessment (Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology).</p> |

| | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|
| 3. An outline of the potential impacts on fish populations and water quality within and downstream of the proposed development area. | Yes | Chapter 8 - Ecology and Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology. | |
| 4. Any potential cumulative impacts on the water quality and fish populations associated with adjacent (operational and consented) developments including wind farms, hydro schemes, aquaculture and mining. | Yes | Any scoped-in relevant cumulative impacts are discussed in Chapter 8 - Ecology and Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology. | |
| 5. Any proposed site-specific mitigation measures as outlined in MD-SEDD generic scoping guidelines and the joint publication “Good Practice during Wind Farm Construction” | Yes | Industry standard good practice and embedded mitigation measures would apply, with more details provided in Chapter 3 - Proposed Development, Chapter 8 – Ecology, Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology , and relevant Appendices of these chapters. See also Chapter 14 - Schedule of Mitigation. | |
| 6. Full details of proposed monitoring programmes using guidelines issued by MD-SEDD and accompanied by a map outlining the proposed sampling and control sites in addition to the location of all turbines and associated infrastructure. At least 12 months of baseline pre- construction data should be included. The monitoring programme can be secured using suitable wording in a condition | No | | Detailed monitoring proposals are not included at this stage. It is expected any fisheries or water quality monitoring requirements will be a condition of consent and proportionate to the type and size of the Proposed Development and considering the baseline conditions. Therefore, due to the typical timescales in application determination and taking account of feedback from relevant consultees, detailed monitoring plans would be prepared post-consent and pre-construction during the discharge of conditions |

| | | | |
|--|----|--|---|
| | | | process in order to take account of any further contemporary information or changes to the Proposed Development. |
| 7. A decommissioning and restoration plan outlining proposed mitigation/monitoring for water quality and fish populations. This can be secured using suitable wording in a condition. | No | | A decommissioning and restoration plan is not included at this stage. It is expected such a plan would be a condition of consent. Given the long timescales involved in reaching the decommissioning phase it is more appropriate to prepare this plan closer to the time of decommissioning in order to account for and consider up to date relevant policy, guidance and standards. |

| Developers should specifically discuss and assess potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the following | Provided in application YES/NO | If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report | If not provided or provided different to MSS advice, please set out reasons. |
|---|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 1. Any designated area (e.g. SAC), for which fish is a qualifying feature, within and/or downstream of the proposed development area. | Yes | The River Spey SAC is located approximately 0.29km south of the Proposed Development, at its closest point (Figure 8.1), and is considered in Chapter 8 – Ecology and Appendix 8.1 . | |
| 2. The presence of a large density of watercourses. | Yes | Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology | |
| 3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits. | Yes | Chapter 10 - Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology | |
| 4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area. | No | | No known acidification problems and acidification not highlighted as catchment pressures in SEPA Water Framework Directive classification reporting. Specific additional site pressures not known, although acidification is unlikely to be a factor |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>given the very low coniferous tree cover at and around the site. May be negative effects on water quality from extensive peat erosion in the catchment.</p> <p>General catchment and regional pressures may exist, for instance due to barriers and climate change. Watercourses above Spey Dam are likely underutilised by migratory fish, as it poses a notable, if not impassable, barrier to fish migration.</p> |
| 5. Proposed felling operations. | Yes | No felling is predicted as part of the Proposed Development. The UGC will pass through a very small area of recently planted broadleaved trees within the perimeter of Melgarve substation. | |