

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	This is provided in Figure 2.1: Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 3a) , Figure 8.1: Surface Water Features (EIAR Volume 3a) and Figure 8.2: Water Resources (EIAR Volume 3a) .	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	N/A	Baseline data for freshwater macro-invertebrate and fish is generally used for monitoring water quality and establishing baseline conditions (unless rare/legally protected species are known to be present). Should consent be granted for the Proposed Development, baseline aquatic monitoring would be established following standardised methodologies. Macro-invertebrates (with one exception, the globally threatened and legally protected freshwater pearl mussel) and fish have therefore not been subject to further consideration within the EIAR, except in relation to pre-construction baseline survey requirements. Watercourses in the Study Area were assessed for potential freshwater pearl mussel habitat and none of the watercourses held potential habitats and no evidence of freshwater pearl mussel was recorded. Therefore, freshwater pearl was not considered further within the EIAR. Refer to Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2).
3. An outline of the potential impacts on fish populations and water quality within and downstream of the proposed development area;	Yes/No	Refer to Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (EIAR Volume 2) for information on water quality.	Fish was scoped out of the EIAR for further consideration. Refer to the text above and refer to Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2).
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/No	Potential cumulative effects from other operational and consented wind farms and energy infrastructure developments in the surrounding area were considered within Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (EIAR Volume 2). Due to the limited hydrological connectivity between sites and the implementation of consistent good practice and embedded mitigation, no significant cumulative impacts on	Fish was scoped out of the EIAR for further consideration. Refer to the text above and refer to Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2).

		hydrology and hydrogeology are anticipated.	
--	--	---	--

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	Outlined in Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 4) .	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.	Yes/No	Should consent be granted for the Proposed Development, baseline aquatic monitoring would be established following standardised methodologies. Detailed monitoring proposals are not included at this stage. Refer to Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2) .	Detailed monitoring proposals are not included at this stage. It is expected any fisheries or water quality monitoring requirements will be a condition of consent and proportionate to the type and size of the Proposed Development and considering the baseline conditions. Therefore, due to the typical timescales in application determination and taking account of feedback from relevant consultees, detailed monitoring plans would be prepared post consent and pre-construction during the discharge of conditions process in order to take account of any further contemporary information or changes to the Proposed Development.
7. A decommissioning and restoration plan outlining proposed mitigation/monitoring for water quality and fish populations. This can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.	No	N/A	A decommissioning and detailed restoration plan are not included at this stage. It is expected that such plans 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. An Outline Biodiversity and Enhancement

			Management Plan (OBEMP) has been prepared as part of the EIAR which outlines proposed restoration and enhancement measures for the Proposed Development (Technical Appendix 6.5: Outline Biodiversity and Enhancement Management Plan (EIAR Volume 4)).
--	--	--	--

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	Fish have been scoped out of the EIA Report as outlined in Chapter 6: Ecology (EIA Volume 2) .	
2. The presence of a large density of watercourses;	Yes	Baseline conditions and water classification data are presented in Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (EIA Volume 2) .	
3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits;	Yes	The peat baseline and mitigation measures proposed are outlined in Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (EIA Volume 2) .	
4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area; and	No	Baseline conditions and water classification data is presented in Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology, Geology and Soils (EIA Volume 2) . Acidification is not recorded as an existing water quality pressure. Fish have been scoped out of the EIA Report as outlined in Chapter 6: Ecology (EIA Volume 2) .	
5. Proposed felling operations.	No	N/A	Felling not required for Proposed Development.