

ANNEX 1 (REVISED JUNE 2023)

MD-SEDD – EIA Checklist

The generic scoping guidelines should ensure that all matters relevant to freshwater and diadromous fish and fisheries have been addressed and presented in the appropriate chapters of the EIA report. Use of the checklist below should ensure that the EIA report contains the following information; the absence of such information ***may necessitate requesting additional information*** which could delay the process:

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 MD-SEDD advice, please set out reasons.
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;	Yes	Volume 3, Figures 3.1.1 to 3.1.26: Proposed Development for which Section 37 consent (Electricity Act, 1989) is sought. Volume 3, Figures 13.2.1 to 13.2.26: Hydrology, flood risk and buffers.	
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. This should be carried out where a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is present and where salmon are a qualifying feature, and in exceptional	Partial	Description and results of assessment of habitat potential for Atlantic salmon is provided in Volume 5, Appendix 11.3: Protected Species Survey Report, and Volume 3, Figure 11.6: Protected Species Survey Results.	Electrofishing, water quality, and instream fish habitat surveys have not been conducted for the Proposed Development as per the Scoping Report. The Proposed Development will oversail the majority of watercourses, and particularly the major rivers with the greatest potential/known populations of fish. Instream works are limited to access tracks requiring new or upgraded crossings on smaller watercourses and field drains. As per the embedded mitigation in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology, watercourse crossings have been minimised, and the design of watercourse crossings will maintain passage for aquatic species (with the exception of pipe culverts on field drains where appropriate). As such, characterisation surveys for fish were scoped out, with the exception of a limited number of potentially sensitive locations that were noted via a risk assessment process agreed with NatureScot.

			Volume 2, Chapter 13 Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils also outlines the watercourse crossings required for the Proposed Development, none of which are designated watercourses within the riverine SACs and is supported by Volume 5, Appendix 13.1: Watercourse Crossing and Buffers .
--	--	--	---

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 MD-SEDD advice, please set out reasons.
cases when required in the scoping advice for other reasons. In other cases, developers can assume that fish populations are present;			
3. An outline of the potential impacts on fish populations and water quality within and downstream of the proposed development area;	Partial	Impacts on Atlantic salmon are considered in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology and Appendix 12.3: Shadow Habitat Regulations Appraisal . Volume 2, Chapter 13: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils.	Atlantic salmon was scoped into the assessment and therefore has been considered in the assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology . Other fish species were scoped out of the assessment and therefore are not considered in the assessment. Water quality is considered in Volume 2, Chapter 13: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils . In addition, potential effects resulting from electromagnetic frequencies (EMF) associated with conductors has been considered; see Appendix 12.3: Shadow Habitat Regulations Appraisal .
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;	Partial	Impacts on Atlantic salmon are considered in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology and Appendix 12.3: Shadow Habitat Regulations Appraisal . Volume 2, Chapter 13:	Atlantic salmon was scoped into the assessment, and therefore has been considered in the cumulative assessment presented in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology . Other fish species were scoped out of the assessment and therefore are not considered in the cumulative assessment. Water quality is considered in Volume 2, Chapter 13: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils .

		Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils.	
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” (https://www.nature.scot/guidance-good-practice-during-wind-farm-construction);	Yes	Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology. Volume 2, Chapter 13: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils. Volume 2, Chapter 17: 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.			

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 MD-SECC advice, please set out reasons.
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		Decommissioning is scoped out of the assessment (see Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology for detail). An Outline Decommissioning Mitigation Strategy has been provided in Volume 5, Appendix 3.6 which has been prepared as a high-level statement of the approach and commitment to mitigating potentially significant effects from future decommissioning activities associated with the Proposed Development.

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 MD-SEDD 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	Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology. Volume 5, Appendix 11.1: Desk Study and Legal Context. Volume 5, Appendix 12.3: Shadow Habitat Regulations Appraisal. Volume 3, Figure 11.2: Designated Sites within 10 km, 5 km and 2 km of the Proposed Development.	
2. The presence of a large density of watercourses;	Yes	Volume 3, Figure 13.1: Hydrology overview.	
3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits;	Yes	Volume 3, Figure 13.7: Carbon and Peatland classification (NatureScot, 2016) and Figure 13.8: Probe depths.	
4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area; and	No		No known acidification problems. No information gathered regarding existing pressures on fish populations as majority of fish species have been scoped out of the assessment. The exception is Atlantic salmon; however the Proposed Development will oversail the majority of watercourses, and particularly the major rivers with the greatest potential/known populations of Atlantic salmon. Instream works are limited to access tracks requiring new or upgraded crossings on smaller watercourses and field drains. As per the embedded mitigation in Volume 2, Chapter 11: Ecology , watercourse crossing have been minimised, and the design of watercourse crossings will maintain passage for aquatic species (with the exception of pipe culverts on field drains where appropriate).
5. Proposed felling operations.	Yes	Volume 3, Figure 8.4: Proposed Development Felling Plan	