

Technical Appendix 6.8: MD-SEDD Checklist

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: Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2) for full details. The Proposed Development and infrastructure is shown on Figure 2.1 (EIAR Volume 4) .	
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.	Yes	Fisheries baseline characterisation information and locations of contemporary electrofishing sampling sites are detailed and presented in Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2), Technical Appendix 6.5: Fish Survey Report (EIAR Volume 4) and on Figure 6.13 (EIAR Volume 3a) . Further information relating to site hydrology is contained within Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (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	Refer to Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2) and Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (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	Any scoped-in relevant cumulative impacts are discussed in Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2) and Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (EIAR Volume 2) .	

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.
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 2: Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2) , Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2) , and Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (EIAR Volume 2) (and relevant Technical Appendices of these chapters). 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 6.7: OBEMP (EIAR Volume 4)). The OBEMP includes proposals on the creation and enhancement of native broadleaved riparian woodland, which would have beneficial effects on water quality interests and fisheries interests.	
6. Full details of proposed monitoring programmes using guidelines issued by MD-SEDD and accompanied by a map outlining the proposed sampling and control sites in addition to the location of all turbines and associated infrastructure. At least 12 months of baseline pre- construction data should be included. The monitoring programme can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.	No		Detailed monitoring proposals are not included at this stage. It is expected any fisheries/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 (see Chapter 6: Ecology (EIAR Volume 2) , Technical Appendix 6.5: Fish Survey Report (EIAR Volume 4) for results from fish surveys).
7. A decommissioning and restoration plan outlining proposed mitigation/monitoring for water quality and fish populations. This can be secured using suitable wording in a condition.	No		A decommissioning and restoration plan is not included at this stage. It is expected such a plan would be a condition of consent. Given the long timescales involved in reaching the decommissioning phase it is more appropriate to prepare this plan closer to the time of decommissioning in order to account for and consider up to date relevant policy, guidance and standards.

Developers should specifically discuss and assess potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures associated with the following:	Provided in application YES/NO	If YES – please signpost to relevant chapter of EIA Report	If not provided or provided different to 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		No designated sites with relevant qualifying features within and/or downstream of the Proposed Development.
2. The presence of a large density of Watercourses.	Yes	Refer to Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (EIAR Volume 2) .	
3. The presence of large areas of deep peat deposits.	Yes	Refer to Chapter 8: Hydrology, Hydrogeology and Geology (EIAR Volume 2) .	
4. Known acidification problems and/or other existing pressures on fish populations in the area.	No		Specific additional Site pressures not known, although acidification may be a factor due to the coniferous tree cover to the northwest of the Site. General catchment and regional pressures may exist, for instance due to barriers and climate change. Fisheries surveys undertaken to date for the Proposed Development indicate Glenkip Burn watercourses appear to be underutilised by trout caused by barriers to migration further downstream (see Technical Appendix 6.5 (EIAR Volume 4)).
5. Proposed felling operations.	Yes	No felling is predicted as part of the construction of the Proposed Development. Refer to Chapter 2: Proposed Development (EIAR Volume 2) .	