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

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

MD-SEDD Standard EIA Report Requirements	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to **MD-SEDD** advice, please set out reasons.
1. A map outlining the proposed development area and the proposed location of: ○ the turbines, ○ associated crane hard standing areas, ○ borrow pits, ○ permanent meteorological masts, ○ access tracks including watercourse crossings, ○ all buildings including substation, battery storage; ○ permanent and temporary construction compounds; ○ all watercourses; and ○ contour lines.	Yes	Refer to **Chapter 2: Site Selection and Design Evolution** and **Chapter 3: The Proposed Development** for full details. The Proposed Development area and infrastructure is shown on **Figure 1.2**.	N/A

2. A description and results of the site characterisation surveys for fish (including fully quantitative electrofishing surveys) and water quality including the location of the electrofishing and fish habitat survey sites and water quality sampling sites on the map outlining the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure. This should be carried out where a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is present and where salmon are a qualifying feature, and in exceptional cases when required in the scoping advice for other reasons. In other cases, developers can assume that fish populations are present.	No		New fish surveys were not undertaken specifically for the Proposed Development, as in the professional view of the EIA team, there was sufficient desk-based information available from other sources to accurately characterise the site with respect to fisheries interests. In particular, surveys undertaken for the adjoining and under-construction Hagshaw Hill Repowering Wind Farm, the under-construction Douglas West Extension Wind Farm, and the operational Galawhistle Wind Farm, which share the same area/catchment of watercourses as the Proposed Development. The site is known to be inaccessible to migratory salmonids, with the site's watercourses being fishless or containing variable densities of resident brown trout only. Further details are provided in **Chapter 7: Ecology**. Similarly, there is water quality and classification data published by SEPA which is presented in the baseline hydrology assessment (**Chapter 9: Geology, Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Peat**).
3. An outline of the potential impacts on fish populations and water quality within and downstream of the proposed development area.	Yes	Refer to **Chapter 7** and **Chapter 9**.	N/A

4. Any potential cumulative impacts on the water quality and fish populations associated with adjacent (operational and consented) developments including wind farms, hydro schemes, aquaculture and mining.	Yes	Any scoped-in relevant cumulative impacts are discussed in **Chapter 7** and **Chapter 9**.	

5. Any proposed site specific mitigation measures as outlined in **MD-SEDD** generic scoping guidelines and the joint publication "Good Practice during Wind Farm Construction" (https://www.nature.scot/guidance-good-practice-during-wind-farm-construction).	Yes	Industry standard good practice and embedded mitigation measures would apply, with more details provided in **Chapter 3**, **Chapter 7** and **Chapter 9** (and relevant Technical Appendices). Additional mitigation, compensation and enhancement measures are proposed as part of the Proposed Development's Outline Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan (OBEMP) (see **Technical Appendix 7.5**). The OBEMP includes proposals on the creation and enhancement of native broadleaved riparian woodland, which would have beneficial effects on water quality interests and potentially downstream fisheries interests.	N/A
6. Full details of proposed monitoring programmes using guidelines issued by **MD-SEDD** and accompanied by a map outlining the proposed sampling and control sites in addition to the location of all turbines and associated infrastructure. At least 12 months of baseline pre-construction data should be included. The monitoring programme can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.	No	N/A	Detailed monitoring proposals are not included at this stage. It is expected any fisheries/invertebrate or water quality monitoring requirements will be a condition of consent. Therefore, due to the typical timescales in application determination and taking account of feedback from relevant consultees, detailed monitoring plans would be prepared post-consent and pre-construction during the discharge of conditions process in order to take account of any further contemporary information or changes to the Proposed Development. It is expected that a water quality monitoring plan and a fisheries monitoring

			programme will be required. Further, as part of any BEMP implemented, and in consultation with the Clyde River Foundation, pre-construction surveys including electrofishing and fish habitat suitability surveys would be undertaken in advance of construction of the Proposed Development as well as during-construction monitoring surveys, to ensure that any proposals benefit the trout populations, as described in **Chapter 7** and **Technical Appendix 7.5**.
7. A decommissioning and restoration plan outliningproposed mitigation/monitoring for water quality and fish populations. This can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.	No	N/A	A decommissioning and restoration plan is not included at this stage. It is expected such a plan would be a condition of consent. Given the long timescales involved in reaching the decommissioning phase, it is more appropriate to prepare this plan closer to the time of decommissioning in order to account for and consider up to date relevant policy, guidance and standards.

Developers should specifically discuss and assess potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the following:	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to **MD-SEDD** advice, please set out reasons.
1. Any designated area (e.g. SAC), for which fish is a qualifying feature, within and/or downstream of the proposed development area.	No	N/A	No designated site for which fish is a qualifying feature is within and/or downstream of the Proposed Development.
2. The presence of a large density of Watercourses.	Yes	N/A	There are a number of watercourses on and around the site although not a particularly large density. Potential effects on the water environment and appropriate

			mitigation measures are discussed in **Chapter 9**.
3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits.	Yes	N/A	Site specific peat depth probing has shown that the majority of the Proposed Development is located in areas of peat which are <0.5 m deep. Potential effects on peat and appropriate mitigation measures are discussed in **Chapter 9**.
4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area.	No	N/A	Specific additional site pressures not known, although acidification may be a factor due to the coniferous tree cover primarily to the north of the site. General catchment and regional pressures may exist, for instance due to barriers and climate change. Barriers (impassable and partial) to fish migration are present across the site, and as discussed in **Chapter 7**, watercourses within the site are trout rearing areas only.
5. Proposed felling operations.	No	N/A	No felling is predicted as part of the construction of the Proposed Development. Refer to **Chapter 3**.