

APPENDIX V1-3.6: SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION MEASURES

1.	SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION MEASURES	3
1.1	Introduction	3
1.2	Summary of Measures	3

1. SCHEDULE OF MITIGATION MEASURES

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 The purpose of this Appendix is to provide a summary of the mitigation measures proposed throughout this EIA Report, to minimise or offset the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the receiving environment.

1.1.2 During the construction and dismantling phases of the project, relevant mitigation measures will be detailed within and implemented through the site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

1.2 Summary of Measures

1.2.1 **Table 1** provides a summary of those mitigation measures identified throughout the EIA Report. **Table 2** sets out further mitigation measures relevant to the Alternative Alignment within Section 3 of the project.

Table 1 - Summary of Mitigation Measures Identified Throughout the EIA Report

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
General Mitigation			
G1	Construction Employment and Hours of Work	Construction working is likely to be during daytime periods only. Working hours are anticipated 7 days a week between approximately 07.00 to 19.00 March to September and 07.30 to 17.00 (or within daylight hours) October to February. Working hours would be confirmed by the Principal Contractor and agreed with The Highland Council as local authority.	Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.14.4
G2	Best Practice Construction Measures, GEMPs and SPPs	All works would be carried out in accordance with industry best practice construction measures, guidance and legislation, together with General Environmental Management Plans (GEMPs) and Species Protection Plans (SPPs) that have been developed by the Applicant.	Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.16.1 – 3.16.3 Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.5 Volume 5, Appendix V1-3.3: GEMPs and SPPs
G3	Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)	A contractual management requirement of the Principal Contractor would be the development and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This document would detail how the Principal Contractor would manage the site in accordance with all commitments and mitigation detailed in the EIA Report, statutory consents and authorisations, and industry best practise and guidance. The CEMP would also reference the aforementioned GEMPs and SPPs. The implementation of the CEMP would be managed on site by a suitably qualified and experienced Environmental Clerk of Works (ECOW), with support from other environmental professionals as required.	Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.16.4 – 3.16.5 Volume 5, Appendix V1-3.5: GEMPs and SPPs Volume 5, Appendix V1-3.9: Outline CEMP
G4	Restoration and Reinstatement	Reinstatement works are generally undertaken during construction (and immediate post-construction phase) and aim to address any areas of ground disturbance and changes to the landscape as part of the construction works. Such works would involve the reinstatement of areas disturbed during the construction phase. A site reinstatement and restoration plan has been prepared to describe the principles and best practice guidance and measures that would be followed in the reinstatement and restoration of disturbed ground. This is included in Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan and would be developed by the Applicant, the Principal Contractor and consenting authorities as required prior to construction commencing. In more sensitive areas, further site specific measures are required to ensure successful reinstatement, including site specific soil and peat management measures, and the employment of	Volume 1, Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.16.7 – 3.16.14 Volume 5 - Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		specialist advisers (i.e. Ecological Clerk of Works and Landscape Clerk of Works). Such measures are set out in Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan .	
Mitigation for Landscape and Visual (see Volume 2 – Chapter 3)			
LV1	General Landscape and Visual Mitigation	Mitigation would involve the use of best practice construction and reinstatement methods during the implementation phase, to assist with the revegetation of disturbed areas and minimise longer term effects. This would include the use of a Landscape Clerk of Works to monitor works within National Scenic Areas (NSAs) and other identified special areas. Special measures are also identified for the treatment of tracks to be retained in the longer term through the more sensitive landscapes, including NSAs, Wild Land Areas (WLAs) and Special Landscape Areas (SLAs), and to minimise the longer term effects of jointing bays or junction boxes through underground cable parts of the Proposed Development.	Volume 2 – Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.9.3 Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.2
LV2	Implementation Stage – Temporary Working Areas and Compounds	The potential for temporary landscape and visual effects would be a consideration in the identification of temporary working areas and compounds. The avoidance of locations where effects may be significant would be the first consideration in siting these areas. Temporary mitigation measures, such as mounding or fencing, would be applied where avoidance is not found to be practicable.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.3
LV3	Implementation Stage – General Reinstatement of Working Areas and Tracks	<p>The reinstatement of areas disturbed during construction would be fundamental to ensuring that the Proposed Development would be successfully accommodated into the existing landscape in the longer term. Careful reinstatement of landform would be employed across working areas, cable laying corridors and temporary tracks, re-using materials excavated during the construction period to reflect the terrain within adjacent areas. Further details on these measures are included in Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan. Landform would be remodelled around new steel lattice towers, sealing end compounds and cut and fill tracks to ensure that these tied smoothly into their surroundings and to minimise the visual extent of these features where possible – for example, to help conceal foundations, fencing or lower level infrastructure associated with sealing end compounds, or the running surfaces of tracks from visual receptor locations or within the wider landscape.</p> <p>Reinstatement of landform would include the creation of suitable gradients for cut and fill slopes associated with access tracks to enable the replacement of peat / soils and re-establishment of vegetation. Where the receiving terrain is not suitable to allow these gradients, the use of suitable geoengineering techniques, such as jute matting, would be utilised to help establish vegetation and prevent erosion.</p> <p>The natural regeneration of native species is the preferred method of achieving vegetation restoration. Where native soils or vegetation are considered insufficient to support natural re-vegetation, this would be supplemented by seeding with an agreed seed mix. Seeding would only occur within protected areas, with the agreement of NatureScot.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.4 - 1.3.6 Volume 5 – Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
LV4	Implementation Stage – Special Reinstatement Measures for Tracks in Sensitive Areas	<p>Through some of the most remote areas, where permanent access tracks are required for maintenance purposes, special reinstatement considerations are proposed for access tracks to minimise the effects of multiple access tracks on the sense of remoteness or of individual access tracks on scenic qualities. These measures are considered relevant to the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2, for permanent tracks within The Cuillin Hills NSA, and WLA 23; • Section 3, around the remote coast between Gleann nam Beiste and the Kyle Rhea OHL crossing point; and • Section 4 between Srath a' Chomair, and Loch Cuaich, through the Knoydart NSA and WLA 18. <p>Through these sections, there are currently no tracks present or existing tracks / paths are of very low impact unlikely to allow vehicle access (other than ATV) and therefore contributing to an experience of remoteness. Access proposals through these areas comprise either new, permanent tracks or upgrading of the existing low impact paths / ATV tracks. These can be broadly defined as one of two types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spine road tracks, following the alignment of the Proposed Development and providing access to multiple towers; and • Spur accesses to single, or small numbers of towers (up to four). <p>For spine road tracks, it is proposed that these would be narrowed after completion of construction works, by the placement of excavated peat, soils or turves along the verges to a width suitable for Land Rover or all-terrain (ATV) vehicle. Where cut and fill tracks are proposed, any additional materials may be used to provide strategic mounding alongside the track, to help limit its wider visual appearance. In very steep sections, for example, to the rear of Kinloch Hourn, the use of geoengineering techniques are proposed to support the operational track, and to ensure that vegetation can be re-established to minimise its visual effects.</p> <p>Spine road tracks would be surfaced using locally sourced stone, with a colour and tone to match existing exposed bedrock within the nearby landscape. It is anticipated that these measures would ensure that tracks would bed down over time and, by 10 years post construction, would not appear substantially more robust in character than existing similar tracks within these, or other nearby, parts of the landscape.</p> <p>For permanently retained spur tracks within sensitive areas, it is proposed that these would be retained as 'green' tracks. This would involve the retention of the supporting structure of the track, including cut and fill and gradients suitable for vehicular access but using a number of techniques to reduce the visual perception of the running surface of the track. The following options are likely to be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covering the running surface of tracks with a thin layer of top peat or soils and seeding if necessary, to leave a route navigable by ATV vehicles (most likely to be considered only for 	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.7 - 1.3.11

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>short tracks to individual towers within sensitive parts of the Knoydart NSA, such as Loch Coire Shubh);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placing top peat / soil down the centre of the track and seeding if necessary to encourage a vegetated centre line with running surface on either side to support more regular use by vehicles such as land rovers; and Hydro-seeding the running surface of the track with a suitable seed mix and carrier mulch to encourage light vegetation growth across the track's surface which would be able to establish further depending on the regularity and types of use the track would support. 	
LV5	Implementation Stage - Measures to minimise LVIA Effects of Above Ground Features for Underground Cables	<p>To minimise the potential landscape and visual effects of junction boxes and underground jointing bays, the following mitigation measures would be adopted where possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colouring of junction boxes would be carefully considered. A dark brown colour is recommended for boxes within a moorland or forest backdrop when seen from the road or paths. A dark grey colour is considered more suitable for boxes located between the A87 and Loch Sligachan; Soil and turves would be carefully replaced around chamber covers or junction boxes and surface areas of concrete would be avoided as far as possible, to reduce the visual footprint of these areas; Consideration would be given to the detailing around each group of junction boxes to reduce their visual prominence. This may include: For junction boxes in moorland or forest settings: strategic landform and placement of turves or boulders as appropriate to disguise where possible, the foot of boxes or platform areas for underground chamber covers; and For junction boxes along loch shore areas: detailing may reflect that of the recently completed car park area at Sligachan Old Bridge, using features such as drystone walling, turf mounding or scrub planting where possible, to improve the setting of the boxes. 	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.13
	Specific Mitigation (see LV6 to LV11).	Additional specific mitigation measures are recommended for consideration and implementation where possible where it is considered there may be potential to reduce adverse effects on individual receptors or in relation to individual features. However, the implementation of these measures would be dependent upon other external factors, including landowner agreements. Such measures are noted below.	
LV6	Specific Mitigation – Section 1	Route R1-1 (A87): Although no significant effects are anticipated for receptors using this route, minor landform creation is proposed around the proposed sealing end compound at Glen Varragill to help minimise the potential for visibility of the compound area.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
LV7	Specific Mitigation – Section 2	<p>Receptor Location B2-8 (Luib): Although longer term significant effects are not anticipated for receptors in this settlement area, minor landform and planting of native woodland scrub species are recommended to mitigate the visual effects of the nearby sealing end compound and terminal tower.</p> <p>Receptor Locations B2-9 (Dunan) and B2-10 (Strollamus): Although longer term significant effects are not anticipated for receptors in these settlements, strategic planting of native species or woodland scrub building on existing scrub adjacent to the A87 would help to reduce and soften views of towers obtained from these areas with some benefits also occurring for users of the A87 in this area.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1
LV8	Specific Mitigation – Section 4	Local Character Zones (LCZ) 4-2 (Druim Iosal to Kinloch Hourn) and 4-3 (Kinloch Hourn to Loch Cuaich): Where the Proposed Development would pass through areas of ancient woodland, it is recommended that a detailed survey of the woodland should be undertaken prior to tree works taking place and the potential for crown reduction should be prioritised before felling, wherever possible.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1
LV9	Specific Mitigation – Section 5	<p>Route R5-2 (Loch Garry / Loch Cuaich Minor Road): Strategic planting alongside the public road on the approach to Quoich Dam, to soften the visual transition between NeSTS towers and steel lattice towers.</p> <p>Receptor Location B5-12 (Leacan Dubha and Munerigie) strategic native woodland / scrub planting and micro-siting of towers where possible to help soften longer term appearance of towers.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1
LV10	Specific Mitigation – Section 6	Route R6-1 (Minor road between Auchterawe and Fort Augustus): Protection and reinstatement of planting, earthworks and disturbed ground between the minor road and Fort Augustus Substation (to comply with the existing and proposed landscape design of the Fort Augustus Substation Woodland Management Plan). In particular, screening along the south-east of the road to prevent secondary effects resulting from views opening up of the existing substation.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1
Mitigation for Ecology (see Volume 2 –Chapter 4)			
EC1	Good Practice Construction Measures	<p>All works would be carried out in accordance with industry good practice construction measures, guidance and legislation. Furthermore, the Applicant has developed General Environmental Management Plans (GEMPs) and Species Protection Plans (SPPs) in agreement with statutory consultees, including SEPA and NatureScot. The Proposed Development would be constructed in accordance with these plans. Similarly, the Proposed Development would be constructed in accordance with the following relevant plans included with this EIA Report; Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan; Appendix V1-3.8: Dismantling Plan for the Existing OHL; Appendix V1-3.9: Outline Construction Environment Management Plan; and Appendix V2-7.3: Peat Management Plan</p> <p>There would be a contractual management requirement for the successful Principal Contractor to fully implement a comprehensive and Site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This document would detail how the successful Principal Contractor would manage the works in</p>	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.4.3 – 4.4.4</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V1-3.5: GEMPs and SPPs</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Restoration Plan</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V1-3.8: Dismantling Plan for the Existing OHL</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		accordance with all commitments and mitigation detailed in the EIA Report, the Applicant's GEMPs and SPPs, statutory consents and authorisations, and industry good practice and guidance, including pollution prevention guidance.	Volume 5 - Appendix V1-3.9: Outline Construction Environment Management Plan Volume 5 - Appendix V2-7.3: Peat Management Plan
EC2	Micrositing within LoD	Any micrositing of infrastructure within the defined Limits of Deviation (LoD) would be based on a review of existing ecological data and the completion of pre-construction surveys, to take into consideration the potential for direct encroachment onto protected species features, sensitive habitats or GWDTEs, or indirect alteration of hydrological flows supporting sensitive habitats or GWDTEs. Any micrositing would also take consideration of any buffer distances on protected features identified, as detailed within the SPP.	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.4.5
EC3	Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW)	To ensure all reasonable precautions are taken to avoid negative effects on habitats, protected species and aquatic interests, a suitably qualified ECoW would be appointed prior to the commencement of construction to advise the Applicant and the Principal Contractor on all ecological matters. The ECoW would be required to be present onsite during the construction phase and would carry out monitoring of works and briefings with regards to any ecological sensitivities on the Site to the relevant staff of the Principal Contractor and subcontractors.	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.4.6
EC4	Site Reinstatement and Restoration	A site reinstatement and restoration plan has been prepared to describe the principles and best practice guidance and measures that would be followed in the reinstatement and restoration of disturbed ground. This is included in Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan and would be developed by the Applicant, the Principal Contractor and consenting authorities as required prior to construction commencing. In more sensitive areas, further site specific measures are required to ensure successful reinstatement, including Site specific and peat management measures, and the employment of specialist advisors (e.g. ECoWs)	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.4.7 Volume 5 – Appendix V1-3.7: Outline Site Restoration Plan
EC5	Good Practice Measures	Good practice construction measures and further details on working methods, plant requirements, types of materials to be used, access and storage plans, defined working corridors, use of helicopters, reinstatement and restoration plans etc. would form part of the Principal Contractor's Construction Method Statement (CMS).	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.7.1
EC6	Mitigation for Kinloch and	Additional mitigation, over and above that included as standard, includes an operational wayleave maintenance plan for the Kinloch and Kyleakin Hills SAC and SSSI, and the following mitigation for	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.7.2

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
	Kyleakin Hills SAC / SSSI	<p>reducing impacts on the bryophyte and lichen assemblage of the Kinloch and Kyleakin Hills SAC and SSSI:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoiding direct damage to the Nationally Rare and Nationally Scarce bryophyte and lichen interest recorded during surveys within the Kinloch and Kyleakin Hills SAC and SSSI; • retention of existing woodland and scrub habitats, and other scattered trees and willow bushes where feasible within the SAC / SSSI to maintain the bryophyte and lichen interest; • a bryophyte and lichen specialist, or the ECoW (if suitably qualified), to re-visit the Nationally Rare and Nationally Scarce bryophyte and lichen target note locations considered at risk (in Table 1.2 of Appendix V2-4.6 in Volume 5 of this EIA Report) with the Principal Contractor in advance of construction, to demarcate the areas of interest and create an exclusion zone for ecological sensitivities. This demarcated area would be a minimum of 5 m around the feature, but preferably 10 m if possible; • the bryophyte and lichen specialist to undertake further pre-construction checks for Nationally Rare or Nationally Scarce species within likely areas of interest within the proposed footprint of the Proposed Development and demarcate further populations if found; • if required, micrositing of infrastructure within the LoD to avoid the demarcated and protected areas, with no works, or storage of spoil or materials, to take place within the demarcated and protected areas; • regular monitoring of the features to ensure the mitigation measures are effective; and • if it is not possible to microsite or the feature is at risk, then further mitigation proposals and plans would be discussed and agreed with NatureScot in advance of construction occurring within the specific locality. This may include, but not be limited to, translocation proposals to nearby receptor sites with the same suite of environmental conditions, should the species be suitable for translocation. In the event such a measure is proposed, the proposals and plans would be prepared in conjunction with a bryophyte / lichen specialist and agreed with NatureScot. 	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-4.6 – Part 1.7
EC7	Mitigation for otters	To avoid and reduce impacts on otter, construction works would be carried out in line with a detailed otter SPP (Appendix V1-3.5: General Environmental Management Plans (GEMPs) and Species Protection Plans (SPPs)) which would ensure minimising disturbance to otter and compliance with species legislation through the following mitigation:	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.7.3

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-construction surveys in suitable habitat within 200 m of works (to determine use of holts/couches and identify any new protected features or other habitat to the species such as feeding areas and freshwater pools); • All works close to waterbodies and watercourses showing signs of regular use by otters should not take place at night or within 2 hours of sunset / sunrise, if possible (bearing in mind otter in coastal habitats are also active during daytime hours). • Where works close to waterbodies and watercourses are required at night, lighting should be directed away from riparian areas. • All works close to water courses and waterbodies must follow best practice measures to ensure their protection against pollution, silting and erosion. • Any temporarily exposed pipe system should be capped when staff are off site to prevent otters from gaining access. • All exposed trenches and holes should be provided with mammal exit ramps e.g., wooden planks or earth ramps when Contractors are off site. • An emergency procedure should be implemented by site workers if otter / otter resting sites are unexpectedly encountered. All work within 30 m (100 m for high noise/vibration activities) or 200 m for breeding sites should cease until a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist has inspected the site and determined the appropriate course of action. • Where resting sites are confirmed (either during pre-construction surveys or at any time during works), protection zones of either 30 m, 100 m (for high noise / vibration activities) or 200 m (confirmed breeding sites) should be marked appropriately to restrict work access. • Site staff should be briefed of the purpose of the protection zones through a Toolbox Talk and works micro-sited outwith the protection zone. • For any works required within 30 m of resting sites or 200 m of confirmed breeding sites, and for high noise / vibration activities such as pile driving or blasting within 100 m of resting sites, a licence from NatureScot would be required. 	

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The licence application would be accompanied by a Protection Plan which outlines how disturbance would be minimised and specific holts protected, for example through screening of works and modifying protection zones. 	
EC8	Habitat Management Plan (HMP)	The Applicant is committed to delivering a Habitat Management Plan (HMP) for the Proposed Development, details of which would be provided and agreed upon with relevant consultees post-submission of the application and prior to construction commencing, secured by a condition of consent.	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.12.3
EC9	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	BNG is a process which leaves nature in a better state than it started. The Applicant is making a voluntary commitment to incorporate BNG into their projects. A BNG assessment would be completed prior to determination. This would quantify the potential biodiversity impacts for the Proposed Development and assess whether the Proposed Development would result in a net loss, no net loss or a net gain in biodiversity, considering the biodiversity within the Site after habitats are reinstated and the future management of the reinstated and created habitats.	Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.12.6
EC10	Fish and fish habitats	<p>The following measures are recommended to minimise effects on fish and fish habitats in relation to underground cable works in Section 2 and Section 6 of the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys in advance of construction to inform micro-siting of crossing locations (to be carried out at all watercourses where a likelihood of salmonid spawning habitat exists). Considerable care should be taken around crossing points on the River Sligachan and on the Abhainn Ceann Loch Ainort, both of which hold potentially important spawning areas. As an additional safeguard it is recommended that no vehicles should take access to the drilling site by driving in or through the river between October and early May. Where practicable, subject to review by the Principal Contractor against detailed construction programming, it would be preferable for directional drilling at the crossings of the River Sligachan and Abhainn Ceann Loch Ainort to be carried out between March and late September to avoid impacts on spawning fish and eggs in the vulnerable early stages of development when they are susceptible to mechanical shock. Further consultation with SEPA and the relevant District Salmon Fisheries Board will be undertaken as part of this process and prior to works commencing. Any in-river work (if necessary) in the River Sligachan or Abhainn Ceann Loch Ainort should be avoided between October and early May. If it is necessary to take machinery across the Abhainn Ceann Loch Ainort, this should not be done between October and May. 	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 4 – Paragraph 4.4.30</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-4.5: Fish Habitat Survey Report, Part 6</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to the presence of small areas of spawning habitats close to crossing points and downstream, care should be taken to avoid instream working or downstream impacts between late October and early May from machinery involved in directional drilling at crossings within Section 2 of Allt Mòr Doire Mhic-ùin and an unnamed watercourse at the head of Loch Ainort. • Where practicable, trenching for river crossings should be carried out between early May and late October to avoid impacts on spawning fish or developing eggs and fry, as set out in SEPA guidance. However, proposed trenched streams are small, and no significant areas of spawning habitat were found at proposed crossing locations; in stream works are unlikely to have significant impacts on fish or fisheries in these streams provided wider downstream impacts are avoided. • Particular care should be taken within Section 2 at the River Sligachan and Allt Mhic Mhoirein, and within Section 6 at Allt Dail a'Chuirn and Allt Achadh nan Darach Beag to avoid exacerbating naturally-occurring erosion of unstable banks. • Machinery should be kept well back from the stream banks in the section of cable route alongside the Abhainn Torra-mhichaig (Section 2), to avoid further damage to unstable banks. • Implementation and monitoring measures would be undertaken via a Water Quality and Fish Monitoring Plan in line with the Marine Scotland Science guidelines. <p>Although lower suitability habitat for fish was recorded at access track crossing locations during surveys, a similar process would still be carried out for all watercourse crossings during construction.</p> <p>To comply with legislation and ensure protection of fish populations and no deterioration of water quality, the CEMP would ensure effective silt and pollution prevention.</p>	
Mitigation for Ornithology (see Volume 2 –Chapter 5)			
O1	Bird Protection Plan	<p>Construction of the Proposed Development and dismantling of the existing OHL would extend through the breeding (taken as April to August) and non-breeding seasons, taken as being September to March. Where these phases extend into the breeding season then a Bird Protection Plan (BPP) would be enforced. A BPP would detail protocols for the prevention, or minimisation, of disturbance to birds as a result of activities associated with the Proposed Development and would be overseen by the Ecological Clerk of Works. The BPP would be devised in consultation with NatureScot and would be in place prior to the onset of construction and dismantling activities.</p>	<p>Volume 2, Chapter 5 – Paragraph 5.4.8, 5.7.1, 5.12.1</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.5: GEMPs and SPPs</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
O2	Active Nests / Roosts	In the event that an active nest or roost of a Schedule 1 or Schedule 1A species is discovered within distances given by Ruddock & Whitfield (2007) ¹ (or within a 500 m radius of the nest for Schedule 1 species not listed), a disturbance risk assessment would be prepared under the BPP and any measures considered necessary to safeguard the breeding attempt or roost (e.g., exclusion zones or restrictions on timing of works), would be submitted to NatureScot for agreement before recommencing work. Similarly, although the species is not listed on Schedule 1, surveys to locate black grouse lek sites would be undertaken and appropriate measures to safeguard relevant lek sites would be agreed with NatureScot and included within the BPP. Standard forestry guidance would be followed in the case of tree felling operations.	Volume 2 – Chapter 5 – Paragraph 5.7.1, 5.7.2
O3	Section 1 Mitigation	Line marking is proposed, extending either side of a known white-tailed eagle roost site for the duration of the operational period of the Proposed Development within Section 1 to minimise collision risk. Markers would be spaced at 5 m intervals and maintained for the duration of the operational period.	Volume 2 – Chapter 5 – Paragraph 5.10.16
O4	Section 5 Mitigation	Line marking is proposed on two separate parts of the Proposed Development within Section 5, given proximity to the West Inverness-shire Lochs SPA. The earth wire would be marked using reflective Bird Flight Diverters between Towers BF279 to BF306 inclusive and between Towers BF327 to BF337 inclusive to minimise collision risk. Markers would be spaced at 5 m intervals and maintained for the duration of the operational period.	Volume 2 – Chapter 5 – Paragraph 5.10.58
O5	Cuillins SPA - Disturbance at Breeding Sites, Construction Phase	All phases of works within the SPA would be undertaken during the non-breeding season (taken as between September to the end of February) or checked and confirmed by the ECoW that such activities can progress. Works would be temporary, short-term and at distances greater than 1,500 m from known golden eagle breeding sites.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-5.4 – Table 1.1
O6	West Inverness-shire Lochs SPA – Disturbance at Breeding Sites, Construction Phase	All construction and dismantling works within 500 m of the SPA boundary would be undertaken during the non-breeding season (taken as being the period between the end of August to the end of March) when black-throated diver and common scoter are not present (or checked and confirmed by the ECoW that such activities can progress).	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-5.5 – Table 1.1
Mitigation for Water Environment (see Volume 2 – Chapter 6)			
WE1	Construction and Environmental	A contractual management requirement of the successful Principal Contractor would be the development and implementation of a comprehensive and site-specific CEMP. This document would detail how the successful Principal Contractor would manage the works in accordance with all commitments and	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.5.6 - 6.5.11 Volume 5 – Appendix V2-6.3

¹ Ruddock, M. & Whitfield, D.P. (2007). A review of disturbance distances in selected bird species. Report from Natural Research (Projects) Ltd. To Scottish Natural Heritage.

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
	Management Plan (CEMP)	<p>mitigation detailed in the EIA Report, Applicant's GEMPs, statutory consents and authorisations, and industry best practise and guidance, including pollution prevention guidance.</p> <p>The CEMP would also outline measures to ensure that the works minimise the risk to groundwater, surface water, private water supplies, DWPA's, and licensed water uses.</p> <p>It is expected that the following would be included in the CEMP and would ensure the works are undertaken in accordance with good practice guidance, which includes, but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to protect and safeguard private water supplies, drinking water protected areas (DWPA's), and associated distribution pipework; • any above ground on-site fuel and chemical storage would be bunded; • maintenance of emergency spill response kits during the construction works; • employment of a vehicle management system wherever possible to reduce the potential conflicts between vehicles and thereby reduce the risk of collision; • establishment of suitable access routes which minimise the potential requirement for either new access tracks or for tracking across open land which could contribute to the generation of suspended solids; • enforcement of a speed limit to reduce the likelihood and significance of any collisions; • placement of drip trays under vehicles which could potentially leak fuel / oils; • any temporary construction / storage compounds required would be located remote from any sensitive surface water receptors or private water supplies and would be constructed to manage surface water run-off in accordance with best practice; • any water contaminated with silt or chemicals would not be discharged directly or indirectly to a watercourse without prior treatment; and • water for temporary site welfare facilities would be brought to site, and foul water collected in a tank and collected for offsite disposal at an appropriately licensed facility. <p>A wet weather protocol would be developed. This would detail the procedures to be adopted by all staff during periods of heavy rainfall. Toolbox talks would be given to engineering / construction / supervising personnel. Roles would be assigned, and the inspection and maintenance regimes of sediment and runoff control measures would be adopted during these periods.</p> <p>In extreme cases, the above protocol would dictate that work onsite may have to be temporarily suspended until weather / ground conditions allow.</p>	

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		Further, Scottish Water best practice guidance for construction and land management practices in DWPA's would be adhered to and included in the CEMP ² .	
WE2	Ecological Clerk of Works	<p>To ensure all reasonable precautions are taken to avoid negative effects on the water environment, a suitably qualified ECoW) would be appointed prior to the commencement of construction to advise the Applicant and the Principal Contractor on all ecological and hydrological matters. The ECoW would be required to be present onsite during the construction phase and carry out monitoring of works and briefings with regards to any ecological and hydrological sensitivities on the Site to the relevant staff of the Principal Contractor and subcontractors.</p> <p>With respect to the water environment, the ECoW would also have responsibility to ensure water flow paths and quality to water dependent habitat are sustained during all phases of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The ECoW would be retained to oversee habitat restoration works throughout the Proposed Development, providing advice where necessary.</p>	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.5.12 – 6.6.14</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-6.2 Part 2.2.3</p>
WE3	Buffer to Water Features	<p>The Limit of Deviation which forms part of the Proposed Development would be used to micro-site towers on the most suitable ground conditions and in areas where there is least potential to impair water resources during construction of a tower. The preferred location would be determined on site in consultation with the project ECoW.</p> <p>It has been necessary to locate the proposed underground cable in the Abhainn Torra-mhichaig valley, in Section 2, within 20 m of the watercourse due to landscape impacts and engineering feasibility constraints. As above, a Limit of Deviation is proposed, and this would be used by the project ECoW to micro-site the cable works in this location on the most suitable ground conditions and in areas where there is least potential to impair water resources during construction. It is noted that following cable construction works surface ground conditions would be restored.</p> <p>It is recognised that when works are undertaken close to water and within a 20 m buffer (towers located within the 20m buffer are listed in Paragraph 6.6.18 of Chapter 6 in Volume 2), there is a need for increased monitoring and management of construction, dismantling and restoration works. Specific drainage management plans, method statements, monitoring and pollution incident response plans relevant to the works at these locations are required, subject to agreement with statutory consultees, including SEPA.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.17 – 6.6.23
WE4	Water Quality Monitoring (PWS,	Water quality monitoring before and during the construction phase would be undertaken of water sources which have been identified as potentially at risk from the Proposed Development (set out within	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.24 - 6.6.32

² <https://www.scottishwater.co.uk/Help-and-Resources/Document-Hub/Key-Publications/Sustainable-Land-Management>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
	DWPA and Designated Sites)	<p>Confidential Appendix V2-6.3: Drinking Water Protected Area and Private Water Supply Risk Assessment) without implementation of best practice measures.</p> <p>The monitoring would be used to ensure that the water quality and / or quantity water to these sources is not significantly impacted. Monitoring would be carried out at a specified frequency (depending upon the construction phase) on these catchments. An example monitoring protocol is given in Confidential Appendix V2-6.3.</p> <p>As detailed in Confidential Appendix V2-6.3 it is expected that a water monitoring programme proportionate to the risk posed to a PWS source or DWPA area is adopted, with more monitoring (e.g. increased frequency and parameter suite) used at locations where the risk to a water source is greater.</p> <p>This monitoring would continue throughout the construction phase and immediately post construction when works are undertaken near a water source. Monitoring would be used to allow a rapid response to any pollution incident and also to assess the impact of good practice or remedial measures. Monitoring frequency would increase during the construction phase if remedial measures to improve water quality were implemented. Water quality monitoring plans would be developed during detailed design (Scottish Water, SEPA, THC and Skye and Lochalsh Rivers Trust and Ness District Salmon Fishery Board would be consulted on the plan) and would be contained within the CEMP.</p> <p>The performance of the good practice measures would be kept under constant review by the water monitoring schedule, based on a comparison of data taken during construction with a baseline data set, sampled prior to the construction period.</p> <p>The following water dependent designated sites have been identified as being hydraulic continuity with the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1: Sligachan Peatlands SAC and Sligachan SSSI are water dependant and located downstream of the Section 1 of the Proposed Development; • Section 3: Mointeach Lochain Dubha SSSI and SAC and Kinloch and Kyleakin SSSI and SAC; • Section 4: Cosag Sallow Carr SSSI; • Section 5: Loch Garry which is a component part of Western Inverness-shire Lochs SSSI and SPA, and Garry Falls SSSI; and • Section 6: Loch Lundie which is a component part of Western Inverness-shire Lochs SSSI and SPA. <p>Water quality monitoring before and during the construction phase would be undertaken, to ensure that the tributaries of the main channels that discharge to these designated sites have no significant water quality and / or quantity impacts. Monitoring would be carried out at a specified frequency (depending</p>	Volume 5 – Confidential Appendix V2-6.3 – Table 5-1

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>upon the construction phase) on these catchments, and, like the PWS and DWPA monitoring programme would be agreed with statutory consultees including THC, NatureScot and SEPA.</p> <p>Additional water quality monitoring would be undertaken at specific locations where works are proposed within or close to the projects 20 m water buffer.</p>	
WE5	Pollution Risk	<p>Good practice measures in relation to pollution prevention would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • refuelling would take place at least 50 m from watercourses and where possible it would not occur when there is risk that oil from a spill could directly enter the water environment. For example, periods of heavy rainfall or when standing water is present would be avoided; • foul water generated onsite would be managed in accordance with PPG4; • areas would be designated for washout of vehicles which are a minimum distance of 50 m from a watercourse; • washout water would also be stored in the washout area before being treated and disposed of; • a vehicle management plan and speed limit would be strictly enforced onsite to minimise the potential for accidents to occur; • if any water is contaminated with silt or chemicals, runoff would not enter a watercourse directly or indirectly prior to treatment; • water would be prevented as far as possible, from entering excavations such as cable trenches and foundations; • procedures would be adhered to for storage of fuels and other potentially contaminative materials in line with the Controlled Activity Regulations, to minimise the potential for accidental spillage; and • a plan for dealing with spillage incidents would be designed prior to construction, and this would be adhered to should any incident occur, reducing the effect as far as practicable. This would be included in the final CEMP for the Proposed Development. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.33
WE6	Erosion and Sedimentation	<p>Good practice measures for the management or erosion and sedimentation would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all stockpiled materials would be located out with a 50 m buffer from watercourses; • water would be prevented as far as possible, from entering excavations such as cable trenches and foundations through the use of appropriate cut-off drainage; 	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.34

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> where the above is not possible, water would pass through silt / sediment traps to remove silt prior to discharge into the surrounding drainage system; clean and dirty water onsite would be separated, and dirty water would be filtered before entering the water environment; if the material is stockpiled on a slope, silt fences would be located at the toe of the slope to reduce sediment transport; the amount of ground exposed, and time period during which it is exposed, would be kept to a minimum; silt / sediment traps, single size aggregate, geotextiles or straw bales would be used to filter any coarse material and prevent increased levels of sediment. Further to this, activities involving the movement or use of fine sediment will avoid periods of heavy rainfall where possible; and SSEN construction personnel, ECoW, and the Principal Contractor would carry out regular visual inspections of watercourses to check for suspended solids in watercourses downstream of work areas. 	
WE7	Fluvial Flood Risk	<p>It is proposed to adopt Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as part of the Proposed Development. SuDS techniques aim to mimic pre-development runoff conditions and balance or throttle flows to the rate of runoff that might have been experienced prior to development. Good practice in relation to the management of surface water runoff rates and volumes where temporary compounds and laydown areas are proposed would include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> drainage systems would be designed to ensure that any sediment, pollutants or foreign materials which may cause blockages are removed before water is discharged into a watercourse; onsite drainage would be subject to routine checks to ensure that there is no build-up of sediment or foreign materials which may reduce the efficiency of the original drainage design causing localised flooding appropriate drainage would attenuate runoff rates and reduce runoff volumes to ensure minimal effect upon flood risk; and where necessary, check dams would be used within cable trenches in order to prevent trenches developing into preferential flow pathways. <p>Further information on ground conditions and drainage designs would be provided in the final CEMP.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.35 – 6.6.36
WE8	Water Abstraction	<p>Abstraction of water for construction activities may be required from a suitable source yet to be identified. An application for a Controlled Activities Regulations (CAR) Licence would be made to SEPA and</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.38 – 6.6.39

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>managed through the regulation of the CAR Licence(s). Should a suitable source not be identified, a water bowser would be used.</p> <p>Good practice that would be followed in addition to the CAR Licence regulations includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • water use would be planned so as to minimise abstraction volumes; • water would be re-used where possible; • abstraction volumes would be recorded; and • abstraction rates would be controlled to prevent significant water depletion in a source. 	
WE9	Permanent Watercourse Crossings (inc. Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) Crossings)	<p>Good practice in relation to new water crossings involves the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the design of the watercourse crossings would be agreed with SEPA prior to construction and be regulated in accordance with CAR; • the appropriate crossing type would be identified from SEPA's good practice guidance and would take into account any ecological and hydrological constraints; and • the crossing would be sized and designed so as to minimise effect upon flood risk (sized to accommodate at least the 200 year flow). <p>No works are proposed to existing watercourse crossings associated with existing access tracks. Should it become apparent. as part of the detailed design stage of the project, that an existing crossing needs to be replaced then the principles identified above, for new crossings, would be used.</p> <p>Good practice in relation to HDD water crossings includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the design of the works would be informed by site investigation to ensure an appropriate drilling technique is specified; • the works would be undertaken by a suitably experience contractor and be supervised by the site ECoW. • it would be necessary to develop launch and landing pads for the HDD works which would be developed and managed in accordance with the pollution and erosion, and sedimentation best practice discussed above; • the works would be agreed with SEPA prior to construction and be regulated in accordance with CAR; • the works would be undertaken in accordance with a method statement agreed with SEPA and include monitoring the volume of any drilling fluids used, such as bentonite, to ensure no loss of drilling fluid; 	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.40 – 6.6.42</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-6.4 - Part 1.1</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the HDD launch and landing pads would be set sufficiently far from the watercourse so that the banks of the watercourse being crossed are not disturbed by the proposed works; a flood response plan would be developed and then implemented during the works, so that works can cease and be made safe in the event of extreme rainfall and flood levels; and an emergency incident response plan would be prepared and deployed if required during the works. 	
WE10	Installation of Underground Cables and Joint Bays	<p>Underground cable ducts would be installed progressively. The length of time the cable trench would remain open would be minimised. The cable trench would be opened using a tracked excavator. Arisings from the trench would be temporarily stored adjacent to the trench ready for use to restore the trench.</p> <p>Arisings would be stored so that the potential for erosion and sedimentation is minimised. Silt fences, cut-off drains and temporary cover of the stockpiles would be deployed as directed by the ECoW.</p> <p>Vegetation turves would be stored separately to the spoil arisings. Once the cable has been installed in the cable trench arisings would be used to restore the trench and backfilled in the same order that the material was excavated from the trench. Turves would then be replaced on the backfilled trench.</p> <p>If directed by the ECoW, low permeability barriers would be installed in the trench to prevent the trench forming a preferential water flow path. Where ground conditions are saturated a geotextile wrap would be used within the trench to ensure there is no loss of the sand cable surround to adjacent ground.</p> <p>Where required localised temporary pumping of water from the cable trench would be undertaken to maintain safe working conditions and to facilitate cable duct installation. Pumping arrangements would be agreed and supervised by the site ECoW. Pumping would cease once the cable duct has been installed.</p> <p>Following completion of installation of a cable duct a cable team would install (pull) the cables through the ducts. Safeguards used to control pollution, runoff, erosion and sedimentation presented above would be deployed as required.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.43 - 6.6.48
WE11	Temporary Access Tracks	<p>In general, proposed construction site access would be taken via the existing public road network and would make use of existing forest and estate tracks as far as practicable, upgraded as required.</p> <p>The majority of access would be achieved through upgrade of existing and installation of new tracks. Floating stone road construction may be installed in sensitive areas such as over deeper areas of peat and also within parts of the Kinloch and Kyleakin Hills SAC / SSSI. All new tracks would be constructed in accordance with best practice construction methods, and with reference to NatureScot's good practice guide on constructing tracks in Scottish uplands³.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.49 – 6.6.53

³ Constructed Tracks in the Scottish Uplands. Scottish Natural Heritage, September 2015.

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>Fording would be used where an appropriate crossing point is already in place (on current tracks) with a suitable bed for crossing (where necessary the bed would be protected by the installation of bog mats or similar for running on). Fording would only be used where limited traffic is expected and impacts on the bed and crossing point generally would be monitored with appropriate mitigation being implemented if required.</p> <p>For watercourse crossings less than 2 m wide CAR General Binding Rules would be adhered to. Bog mats, or similar, would be positioned across the water course to enable access, where necessary, side rails would be installed with silt mitigation at either end and across, if required, to ensure that silt impacts from vehicles crossing are controlled at all times. Crossings would be cleaned at the end of the day if required.</p> <p>All proposed crossing locations and methodologies and structures for overhead line works would be reviewed and approved by the ECoW, prior to any works being undertaken.</p>	
WE12	Dismantling the Existing OHL	<p>To dismantle the existing OHL, access to each pole or tower location would be required. In the majority of cases, this would require access by tracked vehicles to each pole or tower location. Existing access tracks would be utilised as far as practicable.</p> <p>In more remote areas, including near Kyleakin, within the Kinloch and Kyleakin Hills SAC, and near Kinloch Hourn and Loch Coire Shubh, removal by helicopter is proposed.</p> <p>Measures detailed above (WE4 and WE5) for the control and prevention of pollution, erosion and sedimentation apply to the use of tracks and helicopters during the proposed dismantling works.</p> <p>Wood pole foundations are made up of the poles themselves plus some additional steel and timber below ground level. The extraction method for these is to dig down, remove the poles and backfill.</p> <p>For steel lattice tower locations where an excavator can achieve access, the foundations would be removed to below ground level. For towers where steel needs to be removed via helicopter it is proposed that these would be left in place with the steel cut just above the concrete, where deemed safe to do so. The option exists to fly in material to cover remaining foundation material.</p> <p>Removal of conductors from the existing OHL would be undertaken with minimum disturbance to watercourses. Where conductors need to be pulled across watercourses, this operation would be undertaken swiftly and with minimum disturbance to riparian habitats or stream beds.</p> <p>All dismantling works would be supervised by the project ECoW.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.54 – 6.6.60
WE13	OHL Wood Pole Construction	<p>The following measures are proposed to mitigate the effects of wood pole foundation construction on the water environment:</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.61

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • poles would be located and excavated wherever possible in the driest locations with well consolidated superficial geology, and wetland areas such as deep peat would be avoided. Wherever possible, poles would not be located within 30 m of waterbodies or within 10 m of other watercourses; • wherever possible, poles would be located out with floodplains to reduce potential effects on flooding; • where excavations for poles encounter localised limited quantities of groundwater or become flooded due to surface water runoff or heavy rainfall, appropriate treatment of dewatering would be instigated under direction of the site ECoW; • no dewatering discharge would be permitted directly adjacent to watercourses; • unless directed otherwise by the site ECoW, dewatering discharge would drain across buffer areas of vegetation (e.g. grassland, heather) of at least 20 m width, which would provide for natural attenuation and dispersal of the flow and removal of silt; • where no suitable vegetation is available for natural treatment of dewatering, the discharge would be passed through on-site settling tanks / lagoons prior to discharge by soakaway or to watercourse; • the requirement for dewatering would be minimised in all locations by timely and efficient excavation of the foundation void and subsequent backfilling; • excavated soils would be used to restore each foundation and be placed in the order they were removed from the foundation; • turves would be used to dress the restored foundations; and • all procedures for dewatering would be agreed by the Principal Contractor with SEPA, THC and NatureScot in the CEMP. 	
WE14	Steel Lattice Tower Foundation Construction	<p>The following measures are proposed to mitigate the effects of steel lattice tower foundation construction on hydrology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tower foundations would be located and excavated wherever possible in the driest locations with well consolidated superficial geology. Wetland areas, areas of deep peat and a standoff of 30 m to waterbodies and 10 m to watercourses would be adhered to wherever possible; • wherever possible, towers would be located out with floodplains to reduce potential effects on flooding; 	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6..62

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where excavations for tower foundations encounter localised limited quantities of groundwater or become flooded due to surface water runoff or heavy rainfall, appropriate treatment of dewatering would be instigated under direction of the site ECoW; • no dewatering discharge would be permitted directly adjacent to watercourses; • unless directed otherwise by the site ECoW, dewatering discharge would drain across buffer areas of vegetation (e.g. grassland, heather) of at least 20 m width, which would provide for natural attenuation and dispersal of the flow and removal of silt; • where no suitable vegetation is available for natural treatment of dewatering, the discharge would be passed through on-site settling tanks / lagoons prior to discharge by soakaway or to watercourse; • the requirement for dewatering would be minimised in all locations by timely and efficient excavation of the foundation void and subsequent concrete pouring and backfilling; • excavated soils would be used to restore foundations and be placed in the order they were removed from the foundation; • turves would be used to dress the restored foundations; • all procedures for dewatering would be agreed by the Principal Contractor with SEPA, THC and NatureScot, and detailed in the CEMP; and • the Principal Contractor would develop a method statement to address the transport, transfer, handling and pouring of liquid concrete at tower foundation sites. 	
WE15	Concrete Batching, Transport and Pouring	<p>In relation to works involving concrete batching, transport and pouring, the following mitigation would be adopted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where concrete transfers are required, measures would be adopted at the point of concrete transfer to prevent accidental spillage of liquid concrete and no transfers would be undertaken in proximity to watercourses or areas of standing water; • there would be no wash-out of concrete carrying vehicles at tower foundation sites (except the concrete chute) with wash-out undertaken at the nearest compounds where suitably bunded / protected facilities would be provided. Chutes would be washed out to a suitable container, allowed to settle and disposed at suitably licensed facilities; • excess concrete or wash-out liquid would not be discharged to drains or watercourses. Drainage from washout facilities would be collected and treated or removed to an appropriate treatment point / licensed disposal site; and 	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.63

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vehicles and plant working at tower foundations would be confined to the area required for safe working only to prevent compaction, rutting and habitat damage to adjacent areas of land. Working areas would be clearly marked out and temporary fencing used where risk assessments indicate a requirement. Similar procedures would be adopted to demarcate areas where plant access is required for conductor stringing and tensioning works. 	
WE16	Forest Felling	Felling required to establish the OHL and an appropriate Operational Corridor would be undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance published by Forestry and Land Scotland and overseen by the project ECoW.	Volume 2 – Chapter 6 – Paragraph 6.6.64
WE17	GWDTE	Safeguards would be required during construction and dismantling works to maintain existing surface water flow paths to habitats of high or moderate groundwater dependency. Micrositing would also be required under direction of the project ECoW to safeguard valuable habitats such as flushes. Safeguards would be included in the final CEMP.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-6.2 Part 2.2.3
WE18	Drinking Water Protected Areas	Prior to any development occurring, unconfirmed abstraction points (as listed in Volume 5, Appendix V2-6.3), would be confirmed and the risk the Proposed Development poses to these points would be re-assessed and appropriate mitigation agreed with consultees.	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-6.3 – Paragraph 4.1.1
WE19	Private Water Supply (PWS) Sources	Prior to any development occurring, unconfirmed abstraction points / depths (as listed in Confidential Appendix V2-6.3), would be confirmed and the risk the Proposed Development poses to these PWSs would be re-assessed and appropriate mitigation agreed with consultees.	Volume 5 – Confidential Appendix V2-6.3 – Paragraph 4.1.2
Mitigation for Geology and Soils Environment (see Volume 2 –Chapter 7)			
GS1	Good Practice Measures	<p>The Proposed Development would be in accordance with good practice guidance, including UK and Scottish guidance on good practice for construction projects.</p> <p>A contractual management requirement of the successful Principal Contractor would be the development and implementation of a comprehensive and site-specific Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This document would detail how the successful Principal Contractor would manage the works in accordance with all commitments and mitigation detailed in the EIA Report, Applicant's General Environmental Management Plans (GEMPs), statutory consents and authorisations, and industry best practise and guidance, including pollution prevention guidance.</p> <p>The CEMP would also outline measures to ensure that the works minimise the risk to peat, soils and the geological environment. It is expected that the following measures outlined below would be included in the CEMP and ensure the works are undertaken in accordance with good practice guidance.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.3 - 7.5.5

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
GS2	Geology, Peat and Soils	<p>A Design and Geotechnical Risk Register would be compiled to include risks relating to peat instability, as this would be beneficial in identifying potential risks that may be involved during construction.</p> <p>Good construction practice and methodologies to prevent peat instability within areas that contain peat deposits are identified in Volume 5, Appendix V2-7.2 (Peat Landslide and Hazard Risk Assessment (PLHRA)). These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to ensure a well-maintained drainage system, to include the identification and demarcation of zones of sensitive drainage or hydrology in areas of construction; • minimisation of ‘undercutting’ of peat slopes, but where this is necessary, a more detailed assessment of the area of concern would be required; • careful micro-siting of infrastructure including H poles, tower bases, crane hardstandings and cable route within the Limits of Deviation to minimise effects on the prevailing surface and sub-surface hydrology and geology; • raising peat stability awareness for construction site staff by incorporating the issue into the Site Induction (e.g. peat instability indicators and good practice); • introducing a ‘Peat Hazard Emergency Plan’ to provide instructions for site staff in the event of a peat slide or discovery of peat instability indicators; • developing methodologies to ensure that degradation and erosion of exposed peat deposits does not occur as the break-up of the peat top mat has significant implications for the morphology, and thus hydrology, of the peat (e.g. minimisation of off-track plant movements within areas of peat); • developing robust drainage systems that would require minimal maintenance; • developing drainage systems that would not create areas of concentrated flow or cause over-or under-saturation of peat habitats; • the removal and off-site disposal of soils would be avoided where possible and where soils are considered to have a value with regard to habitat (e.g. peat) and agricultural productivity, and where soils are to be used for restoration purposes following construction; • best practice methods would be followed when handling and storing soil. This would be required in order to preserve soil, structure, texture and avoid compaction within sensitive locations. The principles that would be adopted to manage potential impacts upon soil during construction within the Proposed Development would be set out in the CEMP; and • vehicle movements on untracked ground would be limited to reduce the impact of construction on surface cover loss and soil compaction and in particular in areas with softer drift deposits / soils (for example areas of peatland) and on steeper slopes (e.g. valley sides). 	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.6 - 7.5.7</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-7.2 – Part 1.11</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2- 7.3 – Part 2.1.2 – 2.1.6</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
GS3	Geotechnical Stability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> earth cutting along steeper slopes would be avoided where possible to reduce the impact on slope stability. Where required, suitable engineering would be undertaken to ensure the stability of the slope is maintained, including in areas prone to peat slides. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.7
GS4	Contaminated Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prior to construction works, an assessment would be made by the Principal Contractor as to the potential for contamination based on site specific information regarding potentially contaminated sites; where such investigations identify potentially contaminated land, strategies for mitigation or remediation of the land would be developed and agreed with the regulatory authorities (SEPA and the local authorities) and implemented prior to construction in these locations; and where previously unidentified contaminated land is encountered during construction, appropriate investigation and remedial measures would be developed and implemented by the Principal Contractor in accordance with relevant legislation and regulatory requirements to prevent pollution of environmental receptors and / or risk to human health. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.7
GS5	Underground Cable Installation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> prior to construction working areas would be demarcated with barriers or fencing and signage. prior to construction trench dimensions would be specified and recorded. Any deviation to the specified dimensions would be reviewed with the design team; temporary relatively shallow excavations should be supported with sheet piles or trench sheeting or be battered back to a temporary slope angle of 35 degrees except in peat; excavated materials of different types would be stored separately; such as peat, topsoil, subsoil and rock; the amount of ground exposed, and time period during which it is exposed, would be kept to a minimum to protect the quality and integrity of the peat and soils; trench excavations would be filled with an agreed sand base to be tested for any adverse effects. Once the testing has been approved, the remaining excavation would be backfilled with arisings in reverse order. Any excess natural soil would be spread on the surface in the vicinity of the excavation, or disposed from site; and where dewatering is required within the trench pumping would take place in line with best practice measures described within Volume 2, Chapter 6: Water Environment and the CEMP. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.7
GS6	Temporary Access Tracks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In general, proposed construction site access would be taken via the existing public road network and would make use of existing forest and estate tracks as far as practicable, upgraded as required. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.7

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of access would be achieved through upgrade of existing and installation of new tracks. Floating stone road or trackway panel construction may be installed in sensitive areas such as over deeper areas of peat. All new tracks would be constructed in accordance with best practice construction methods, and with reference to NatureScot's good practice guide on constructing tracks in Scottish uplands. 	
GS7	Pollution Prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> water would be prevented, as far as possible, from entering excavations such as cable trenches and foundations. procedures would be adhered to for storage of fuels and other potentially contaminative materials in line with the Controlled Activity Regulations, to minimise the potential for accidental spillage; and a plan for dealing with spillage incidents would be designed prior to construction, and this would be adhered to should any incident occur, reducing the effect as far as practicable. This would be included in the final CEMP for the Proposed Development. 	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.7
GS8	Wet Weather	<p>A wet weather protocol would be developed. This would detail the procedures to be adopted by all site staff during periods of heavy rainfall. Toolbox talks would be given to engineering / construction / supervising personnel. Roles would be assigned and the inspection and maintenance regimes of soils and erosion control measures would be adopted during these periods.</p> <p>In extreme cases, the above protocol would dictate that work onsite may have to be temporarily suspended until weather / ground conditions allow.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 7 – Paragraph 7.5.8 – 7.5.9
GS9	Peat Instability	<p>The Proposed Development would use the Limit of Deviation specified to avoid areas of potential peat instability wherever possible. Specific measures proposed to minimise the potential effects from peat slide and on peat as a resource are described below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Micrositing would be used during the detailed design and construction phases to further avoid areas of peat or other high-risk areas. This would be undertaken under the direction of an environmental advisor and geotechnical engineer (as necessary). Tracks would be microsited to avoid the need for localised cut and fill, particularly on convex slopes. Underground cabling routes would be restored immediately after construction to minimise risk. Foundation design of proposed towers would consider the use of alternatives to pad and column foundations in areas of loose or deep superficial deposits (including peat) e.g., piled solutions. Geotechnical supervision would be provided throughout the construction phase. A Geotechnical Risk Register would be completed as part of the design phase. 	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-7.2 Peat Landslide Hazard and Risk Assessment – Part 1.11

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the construction phase, all excavated materials would be removed to temporary storage mounds positioned at safe slope gradients and certified by a geotechnical engineer. Loading associated with the construction of floating tracks may lead to unstable ground conditions. Accordingly, all tracks would be, as far as possible, constructed under geotechnical supervision and monitored during and after construction. The earthworks and any excavation for foundations or for access tracks would be designed and undertaken in such a way as to avoid any excavation of toe support material. The excavation of any temporary slopes would be fully designed. The design of any new drainage would be undertaken to ensure no adverse loading is placed on areas of marginal peat stability. Since peat sliding invariably involves increased pore water pressures, it follows that robust drainage plans and engineering control of water during the development should result in a significant overall reduction in the risk of peat instability. 	
Mitigation for Cultural Heritage (see Volume 2 –Chapter 8)			
CH1	Preservation in Situ	<p>Micrositing of the Proposed Development would take into account the desirability of preservation in situ where practicable. Preservation in situ of identified heritage assets would be achieved through marking off those assets that lie within the micrositing allowance prior to commencement of construction of the Proposed Development. Appendix V2-8.2 in Volume 5 sets out individual wood pole or tower locations where micrositing may be necessary to avoid direct impacts on assets.</p> <p>Marking out would be achieved using high visibility marker posts outside the edge of the identified heritage assets and these markers would be retained for the duration of the construction phase. The extent of marking out distances, and any and all assets to be protected in this way shall be agreed following consultation with THC.</p> <p>Assets for marking out would be identified on the ground by a qualified archaeologist using the baseline information provided in Volume 5, Appendix V2-8.2. Marking out of the assets would be undertaken by the appointed Principal Contractor.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-8.1 - Paragraph 1.10.5 – 1.10.7 Volume 5 – Appendix V2-8.2
CH2	Evaluation / Watching Brief / Excavation	<p>If required under the terms of a planning condition, the scope of any requirement for archaeological watching brief(s) during the construction works would be agreed through consultation with THC in advance of development works commencing and would be set out in the WSI.</p> <p>If archaeological watching briefs are required under the terms of a planning condition, where buried remains are encountered during archaeological monitoring of groundworks, further mitigation may be required to a scope of works approved by THC. The preferred mitigation of any new archaeological</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-8.1 - Paragraph 1.10.8 – 1.10.10 Volume 5 – Appendix V2-8.2

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>discoveries would be preservation in situ. Where disturbance of the remains is unavoidable allowance would be made for the excavation of the features to a scheme to be agreed with THC under the terms of the WSI.</p> <p>If significant discoveries are made during any archaeological monitoring works which are carried out, and it is not possible to preserve the discovered site or features in situ, provision would be made for the excavation where necessary, of any archaeological remains encountered. The provision would include the consequent production of written reports, on the findings, with post-excavation analysis conservation of finds and publication of the results of the works, where appropriate.</p> <p>Individual assets that may require detailed survey are set out in Volume 5, Appendix V2-8.2.</p>	
CH3	Construction Guidelines	<p>Written guidelines, in the form of Construction method Statements (CMS) would be issued for use by all construction contractors, outlining the need to avoid causing unnecessary damage to known heritage assets. The guidelines would set out arrangements for calling upon retained professional archaeological support if buried archaeological remains of potential archaeological interest should be discovered in areas not subject to archaeological monitoring.</p> <p>The guidelines would make clear the legal responsibilities places upon those who disturb artefacts or human remains.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-8.1 - Paragraph 1.10.11 – 1.10.12
Mitigation for Forestry (see Volume 2 –Chapter 9)			
FR1	Mitigation During Construction – Good Practice	The Applicant proposes to implement a suite of standard good practice working methods to ensure that all construction activity (including woodland removal) avoids significant effects on ecological and hydrological receptors.	Volume 2 – Chapter 9 – Paragraph 9.6.1
FR2	Mitigation during Construction – Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland	<p>The areas of ancient and semi natural woodland impacted by the Proposed Development (18 ha) could potentially be further reduced through micro-siting within the LoD where a combination of factors (e.g. topography, tower height, tree species and height) may reduce the area of ancient semi-natural woodland defined as being within the Operational Corridor (OC).</p> <p>The extent of tree clearance may be reduced where it can be demonstrated through further detailed survey that the trees can be safely overflown by the OHL conductors or that the trees can be accommodated within closer proximity to the Proposed Development with either no work being required, or a degree of crown reduction only. There may also be opportunities to further retain scrub/understorey layers in areas where existing tree cover does not breach safety clearances and allows for safe construction activity.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 9 – Paragraph 9.6.2

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
FR3	Mitigation during Construction - Forest Land Use Management	<p>In order to address the likely significant effect predicted for forest land-use management in the absence of mitigation, the Applicant has committed to the development of OHL Woodland Reports for each of the forestry and woodland interests (20 in total identified). The OHL Woodland Reports (included in Volume 5: Appendix V2-9.1) identify all areas of felling required to form the OC and access tracks. In addition, the OHL Woodland Reports has sought to reduce the risk of future wind throw by identifying felling to stable forest edges (outside of the OC).</p> <p>The OHL Woodland Reports would also include, but are not limited to, seeking to agree a forest landscape design following good practice as defined by Forestry Commission (Scottish Forestry) Guidance (2014). The delivery of the felling identified in the OHL Woodland Reports has been developed in conjunction with the landowners / forest managers to deliver felling and restocking outwith the OC. The Applicant has agreed the use of the 'OHL Woodland Report' to confirm the extent of woodland removal required. This proposed felling would be further reviewed with the landowners to link this with their existing long-term forest plan / land management plan, which would, once amended, be required to adhere to the UK Forestry Standard (UKFS) as part of the approval process with Scottish Forestry. This approval is required prior to any felling being undertaken outwith the Proposed Development OC or proposed access tracks.</p>	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 9 – Paragraph 9.6.3 – 9.6.4</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-9.1</p>
FR4	Mitigation During Operation	To mitigate the predicted likely significant effect on forest management systems for individual landowners, the Applicant has developed OHL Woodland Reports in conjunction with the relevant landowners / forest managers.	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 9 – Paragraph 9.6.5</p> <p>Volume 5 – Appendix V2-9.1</p>
FR5	Compensatory Planting	<p>Given that the Proposed Development would result in the permanent loss of woodland, the Applicant is committed to making arrangements to plant off-site the equivalent area of woodland as Compensatory Planting, meeting the Scottish Government's CoWRP objective of no net loss of woodland.</p> <p>Following the removal of the existing 132 kV OHL, there is potential for woodland expansion within the historical OC. This presents an opportunity to replant part of the compensatory requirement within close vicinity to the Proposed Development, although this requires to be discussed and agreed with the respective landowners.</p>	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 9 – Paragraph 9.6.6 – 9.6.7</p>
Mitigation for Transport (see Volume 2 –Chapter 10)			
TS1	Construction Traffic Management Plan	The following measures would be implemented through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) during the construction phase and would apply to all sections of the Proposed Development i.e. Sections 0 - 6. The CTMP would be agreed with THC and Transport Scotland prior to construction works commencing:	<p>Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.1</p> <p>Volume 1 – Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.15.4</p>

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where possible the detailed design process would minimise the volume of material to be imported to Site to help reduce Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) numbers; • the use of helicopters for the delivery of materials from identified laydown areas is proposed to be utilised in Section 0, and within more remote parts of the line (e.g. part of Section 3) to minimise vehicular access where practicable; • a site worker transport and travel arrangement plan, including transport modes to and from the worksite (including pick up and drop off times); • all materials delivery lorries (dry materials) should be sheeted to reduce dust and stop spillage on public roads; • specific training and disciplinary measures should be established to ensure the highest standards are maintained to prevent construction vehicles from carrying mud and debris onto the carriageway; • wheel cleaning facilities may be established at the Site entrance, depending the views of THC; • normal site working hours would be limited to between the following hours: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March to September – 07:00 to 19:00 Weekdays and 07:00 to 16:00 Weekends • October to February – 07:30 to 17:00 Weekdays and 08:00 to 16:00 Weekends; • appropriate traffic management measures would be put in place on the A87 and A82 to avoid conflict with general traffic, subject to the agreement of the roads authority, this includes single lane closures along the A87 to facilitate underground cable works to the east of Sligachan. Typical measures would include HGV turning and crossing signs and / or banksmen at the Site access and warning signs, as well as temporary traffic lights on the A87 to enable traffic flows in both directions in the area affected by the installation of underground cables. Where possible, construction traffic would avoid using the B885, to the east and this would be highlighted to drivers through signage; • provide construction updates on the project website and or a newsletter to be distributed to residents within an agreed distance of the Site; • adoption of a voluntary speed limit of 20 mph for all construction vehicles travelling through local villages and towns; 	

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adoption of a maximum speed limit of 15 mph for all construction vehicles travelling on private roads and tracks; • all drivers would be required to attend an induction to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a tool box talk safety briefing; • the need for appropriate care and speed control; • a briefing on driver speed reduction agreements (to slow Site traffic at sensitive locations through the villages); and • identification of the required access routes and the controls to ensure no departure from these routes. 	
TS2	Road Wear and Tear	<p>THC and Transport Scotland may require an agreement to cover the cost of abnormal wear and tear on roads within the study area. Video footage of the pre-construction phase condition of the construction vehicles route would be recorded to provide a baseline of the state of the road prior to any construction work commencing. This baseline would inform any change in the road condition during the construction stage of the Proposed Development. Any necessary repairs would be coordinated with the Roads Authority. Any damage caused by traffic associated with the Proposed Development, during the construction period that would be hazardous to public traffic, would be repaired immediately.</p> <p>Any damage to road infrastructure caused directly by construction traffic would be made good, and street furniture that is removed on a temporary basis would be fully reinstated.</p> <p>There would be a regular road edge review and any debris and mud would be removed from the public carriageway to keep the road clean and safe during the initial months of construction activity, until the construction junction and immediate access track works are complete.</p> <p>Overhead and underground high voltage crossing points would be identified prior to the commencement of construction activities and appropriate actions would be undertaken to highlight these.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.2 – 10.11.6
TS3	Access Improvements	All access junctions would be designed and constructed in accordance with THC design standards.	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.6
TS4	Passing Places	The provision and proposed locations of passing places would be discussed with THC during the recommencement stages of the works. Layby improvement works would ensure that expanded or new laybys on single carriageway sections would be suitable for two HGV and would accord with THC standards.	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.7 – 10.11.10

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>The locations and number of enhanced laybys would be agreed during a site visit with THC.</p> <p>It should be noted that passing places would not be used by drivers of construction vehicles as a place to wait or as a place to park. Local residents would be able to report any instances of inappropriate driving or use of passing places to the project community liaison officer.</p> <p>The Proposed Development is supportive of THC's proposals to upgrade the Old Military Road (C1223) and would provide contributions with other sources for this to be upgraded. The detailed design of the improvements would be agreed with THC and a funding package developed from this.</p>	
TS5	Public Information	SSEN Transmission would ensure information is distributed through its communication team via the project website, local newsletters and social media.	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.11
TS6	Outdoor Access Management Plan	<p>Consideration would be given to pedestrians and cyclists alike due to potential interactions between construction traffic and users of the core path. These measures would be formulated into an Outdoor Access Management Plan.</p> <p>The Principal Contractor would ensure that speed limits are always adhered to by their drivers and associated subcontractors. This is particularly important within close proximity to the core path and at crossing points. Advisory speed limit signage would also be installed on approaches to areas where core path users may interact with construction traffic.</p> <p>Signage would be installed on the Site exit that makes drivers aware of local speed limits and reminding drivers of the potential presence of pedestrians and cyclists in the area. This would also be emphasised in weekly toolbox talks.</p>	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.12 – 10.12.14
TS7	Horses	<p>The British Horse Society recommends the following actions that would be included in the Site training for all HGV staff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on seeing riders approaching, drivers must slow down and stop, minimising the sound of air brakes, if possible; • if the horse still shows signs of nervousness while approaching the vehicle, the engine should be shut down (if it is safe to do so); • the vehicle should not move off until the riders are well clear of the back of the HGV; • if drivers are wishing to overtake riders, please approach slowly or even stop in order to give riders time to find a gateway or lay by where they can take refuge and create sufficient space between the horse and the vehicle. Because of the position of their eyes, horses are very aware of things coming up behind them; and 	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.17

Ref.	Issue	Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all drivers delivering to the Site must be patient. Riders will be doing their best to reassure their horses while often feeling a high degree of anxiety themselves. 	
TS8	Operational Phase Mitigation	Site entrance roads would be well maintained and monitored during the operational life of the development. Regular maintenance would be undertaken to keep the Site access track drainage systems fully operation and to ensure there are no run-off issues onto the public road network.	Volume 2 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.12.18
Mitigation for Recreation and Tourism (see Volume 2 –Chapter 11)			
RT	Outdoor Access	An Outdoor Access and Management Plan would be developed in consultation with The Highland Council and implemented during the construction phase of the project to minimise disruption and ensure the safe use of recreational routes. A Draft Outdoor Access Management Plan is included in Volume 5, Appendix V2-11.1.	Volume 2 – Chapter 11 – Paragraph 11.7.39 Volume 5 – Appendix V2-11.1: Draft Outdoor Access Management Plan

Table 2 - Summary of Further Mitigation Measures Identified in Volume 6 of the EIA Report for the Alternative Alignment in Section 3

Ref.	Issue	Further Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
Mitigation for Landscape and Visual (see Volume 6 – Chapter 3)			
A-LV1	Specific Mitigation – Alternative Alignment in Section 3	<p>Further specific mitigation measures to minimise or compensate for individual effects are recommended for consideration and implementation where possible in relation to the Alternative Alignment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptor Location B3B-5 (Kyle Rhea), and Route R3B-16 (Kyle Rhea Otter Hide footpath) and Outdoor Location O3B-2 (Otter Hide Car Park and Picnic Area): Targeted native woodland planting to mitigate visual effects of towers at close proximity; and • Route R3B-6 (Glen Arroch / Kyle Rhea Minor Road) and Outdoor Location O3B-1 (Bealach Udal): Potential improvements to the Bealach Udal viewpoint location to help offset negative visual effects to visual receptors. This could involve improvements to parking, improvements to the viewing experience such as interpretation, and strategic planting or placement of rocks to soften views of individual towers from this location. 	Volume 6 – Chapter 3 – Paragraph 3.8.2
A-LV2	Implementation Stage – Special Reinstatement Measures for Tracks in Sensitive Areas	<p>Through some of the most remote areas, where permanent access tracks are required for maintenance purposes, special reinstatement considerations are proposed for access tracks to minimise the effects of multiple access tracks on the sense of remoteness or of individual access tracks on scenic qualities. For the Alternative Alignment in Section 3, these measures are considered relevant to the area between the Bealach Udal and Kylerhea Glen minor road.</p> <p>In this section, there are currently no tracks present or existing tracks / paths are of very low impact unlikely to allow vehicle access (other than ATV) and therefore contributing to an experience of remoteness. Access proposals through this area comprise either new, permanent tracks or upgrading of the existing low impact paths / ATV tracks. These can be broadly defined as one of two types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spine road tracks, following the alignment of the Proposed Development and providing access to multiple towers; and • Spur accesses to single, or small numbers of towers (up to four). <p>For spine road tracks, it is proposed that these would be narrowed after completion of construction works, by the placement of excavated peat, soils or turves along the verges to a width suitable for Land Rover or all-terrain (ATV) vehicle. Where cut and fill tracks are proposed, any additional materials may be used to provide strategic mounding alongside the track, to help limit its wider visual appearance. In very steep</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.3.7 - 1.3.11

Ref.	Issue	Further Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
		<p>sections, the use of geoengineering techniques are proposed to support the operational track, and to ensure that vegetation can be re-established to minimise its visual effects.</p> <p>Spine road tracks would be surfaced using locally sourced stone, with a colour and tone to match existing exposed bedrock within the nearby landscape. It is anticipated that these measures would ensure that tracks would bed down over time and, by 10 years post construction, would not appear substantially more robust in character than existing similar tracks within these, or other nearby, parts of the landscape.</p> <p>For permanently retained spur tracks within sensitive areas, it is proposed that these would be retained as 'green' tracks. This would involve the retention of the supporting structure of the track, including cut and fill and gradients suitable for vehicular access but using a number of techniques to reduce the visual perception of the running surface of the track. The following options are likely to be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covering the running surface of tracks with a thin layer of top peat or soils and seeding if necessary, to leave a route navigable by ATV vehicles; • Placing top peat / soil down the centre of the track and seeding if necessary to encourage a vegetated centre line with running surface on either side to support more regular use by vehicles such as land rovers; and • Hydro-seeding the running surface of the track with a suitable seed mix and carrier mulch to encourage light vegetation growth across the track's surface which would be able to establish further depending on the regularity and types of use the track would support. 	
A-LV3	Specific Mitigation – Alternative Alignment in Section 3	<p>Receptor Location B3B-5 (Kyle Rhea), Route R3B-16 (Kyle Rhea Otter Hide footpath) and Outdoor Location O3B-2 (Otter Hide Car Park and Picnic Area): Targeted native woodland planting could mitigate visual effects of towers at close proximity; and</p> <p>Route R3B-6 (Glen Arroch / Kyle Rhea Minor Road) and Outdoor Location O3B-1 (Bealach Udal): Potential improvements to the Bealach Udal viewpoint location to help offset negative effects to visual receptors. This could involve improvements to parking, improvements to the viewing experience such as interpretation, and strategic planting or placement of rocks to soften views of individual towers from this location.</p>	Volume 5 – Appendix V2-3.13 – Paragraph 1.4.1
Mitigation for Ornithology (see Volume 6 – Chapter 5)			
A-O1	Specific Mitigation – Alternative Alignment in Section 3	<p>Line marking is proposed between towers QBE87 to QB71B for the duration of the operational period of the Alternative Alignment within Section 3.</p> <p>Markers would be spaced at 5 m intervals and maintained for the duration of the operational period.</p>	Volume 6 – Chapter 5 – Paragraph 5.8.1
Mitigation for Cultural Heritage (see Volume 6 – Chapter 8)			

Ref.	Issue	Further Mitigation / Monitoring Measure	EIA Report Reference
A-CH1	Preservation in Situ	<p>Assets for marking out would be identified on the ground by a qualified archaeologist using the baseline information provided in Volume 6, Appendix V6-8.2.</p> <p>Marking out of the assets would be undertaken by the appointed Principal Contractor.</p>	<p>Volume 6 – Chapter 8 – Paragraph 8.61-8.6.2</p> <p>Volume 6 – Appendix V6-8.1</p> <p>Volume 6 – Appendix V6-8.2</p>
Mitigation for Transport (see Volume 6 – Chapter 10)			
A-TS1	Specific Mitigation for the Alternative Alignment in Section 3	<p>The proposed mitigation measures set out in TS1-8 above would still remain valid, albeit with localised enhancements to cater for the effects of any change in access and routing to accommodate the Alternative Alignment in Section 3.</p> <p>Should the Alternative Alignment be progressed, the Applicant would agree any changes with Transport Scotland and THC prior to works commencing and would agree any necessary changes to the CTMP and Section 96 road bond value. This would be secured by a condition of consent.</p>	<p>Volume 6 – Chapter 10 – Paragraph 10.2.3 – 10.2.4</p>