

3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

1. This section sets out the process that has been followed in undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Amended Project and in preparing this ES Addendum.
2. The EIA process and principles outlined in the Original ES (Section 4: EIA Process and Methodology) have been carried through to the post submission stage and remain valid for the preparation of this ES Addendum.
3. In addition to the EIA conducted for the 'worst case' scenarios within the Amended Project's Rochdale Envelope (see further Section 4: Amended Project Description), this ES Addendum also presents, where applicable, a discussion of the 'most likely' scenario, as introduced in Section 1: Introduction.
4. This ES Addendum has been prepared in accordance with the following regulations:
 - The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2000, as amended by The Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2008 (where applicable); and
 - The Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2007, as amended by the Marine Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (where applicable).
5. The above regulations are collectively referred to in this ES Addendum as the 'EIA Regulations'.

3.2 EIA PROCESS AND OVERARCHING METHODOLOGY

3.2.1 KEY EIA REQUIREMENTS

6. The EIA requirements for the ES Addendum remain unchanged from those described in Section 4.2.1 of the Original ES.

3.2.2 EIA TERMINOLOGY

7. The EIA terminology for the ES Addendum remains unchanged from that described in Section 4.2.2 of the Original ES.

3.3 SCOPE OF THE ES ADDENDUM

8. As described in Section 1: Introduction, the scope of the ES Addendum has been determined through advancements in assessment techniques, methodologies and knowledge of receptors; review of consultation responses to the Original ES and ongoing stakeholder consultation; the publication of further cumulative information; and minor amendments to the Original Project parameters.
9. Consultation which has fed into the scope of the ES Addendum includes written consultation responses, meetings and other ongoing communications. The key consultation responses are outlined in Section 3.8 and detailed in the respective technical assessment Sections 5 to 14.

10. As stated in Section 1: Introduction, this ES Addendum ensures the EIA takes account of the factors summarised above (and in Section 1: Introduction) by including the following additions, revisions and supplementary information to the Original ES:
- Section 5: Fish and Shellfish Ecology presents an addendum to Original ES Sections 11: Wind Farm Fish and Shellfish Ecology and 23: OfTW Fish and Shellfish Ecology. Amendments to the fish and shellfish ecology assessment include:
 - Further information on Suspended Sediment Concentrations and Sediment Re-deposition during construction/decommissioning (Section 5.6.1.1);
 - Construction/decommissioning noise (5.6.1.1);
 - Operational effects on fish from loss of habitat (Section 5.6.1.2);
 - Operational effects on fish from introduction of new habitat (Section 5.6.1.2);
 - Operational effects on fish from electro-magnetic fields (Section 5.6.1.2);
 - Further information on the mitigation and monitoring of effects (Sections 5.7 and 5.8);
 - Operational noise effects (Section 5.6.1.2);
 - Operational effects resulting in changes to fishing activity (Section 5.6.1.2); and
 - Cumulative effects (Section 5.9).
 - Section 6: Marine Mammals presents an addendum to Original ES Sections 12: Wind Farm Marine Mammals and 24: OfTW Marine Mammals. Amendments to the marine mammals assessment include:
 - Effects of noise emissions during pile driving on marine mammals (Section 6.6.1.1);
 - Further information on the mitigation and monitoring of effects (Sections 6.7 and 6.8);
 - Long-term population modelling of effects on Bottlenose Dolphin and Harbour Seal (Section 6.6.1.1);
 - Comparison of effects at different hammer energies on marine mammals (Section 6.6.1.2);
 - Interaction of effects on marine mammals (Section 6.6.1.3); and
 - Cumulative effects (Section 6.9).
 - Section 7: Ornithology presents an addendum to Original ES Section 13: Wind Farm Ornithology. This ES Addendum does not apply to Section 25: OfTW Ornithology of the Original ES. Amendments to the ornithology assessment include:
 - Presentation of outputs from stochastic population modelling used to estimate potential effects on the populations of fulmar, gannet, kittiwake, herring gull, great black-backed gull, guillemot, razorbill and puffin. This includes discussion of how impact significance has been derived from probabilistic population model predictions (Section 7.5.3);
 - Revised methods for estimating displacement effects for fulmar, gannet, kittiwake, guillemot, razorbill and puffin (Section 7.5.1);

- Reassessment of collision effects using the stochastic population models (Section 7.6.3);
 - Consideration of non-breeding season collision effects for gannet, kittiwake, herring gull and great black-backed gull (Section 7.6.5);
 - Consideration of total impacts (collision and displacement) for fulmar, gannet and kittiwake (Section 7.6.4); and
 - Reassessment of potential cumulative impacts on the basis of updated information now available for other sites (Section 7.9.3).
 - Section 8: Seascape, Landscape and Visual presents an addendum to Original ES Section 14: Wind Farm Seascape, Landscape and Visual. Amendments to the Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA) include:
 - An assessment of coastal character areas (Section 8.6.1);
 - Assessment of a new viewpoint at Lybster Harbour (Section 8.6.2); and
 - Cumulative effects (Section 8.8).
 - Revised assessments of technical topics from the Original ES whose assessment may have been affected by Project amendments, including the amendment to the OfTW Corridor, change in jack-up vessel footprint and/or changes to OfTW cable installation timescales. These technical topics are:
 - Section 9: Physical Processes and Geomorphology (OfTW Corridor; jack-up footprint and OfTW cable installation timescales);
 - Section 10: Benthic Ecology (OfTW Corridor; jack-up footprint and OfTW cable installation timescales);
 - Section 11: Marine Archaeology and Cultural Heritage (OfTW Corridor and OfTW cable installation timescales);
 - Section 12: Commercial Fisheries (OfTW Corridor and OfTW cable installation timescales);
 - Section 13: Shipping and Navigation (OfTW Corridor and OfTW cable installation timescales); and
 - Section 14: Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism (OfTW Corridor and OfTW cable installation timescales).
11. This ES Addendum does not present a revised assessment of all the topics presented in the Original ES. Table 3.1 identifies the topic areas from the Original ES included within the scope of this ES Addendum.

Table 3.1: Topic Areas included within the ES Addendum

Topic Area	Original ES	ES Addendum
Physical Processes and Geomorphology	✓	✓
Benthic Ecology	✓	✓
Fish and Shellfish Ecology	✓	✓
Marine Mammals	✓	✓
Ornithology	✓	✓
Seascape, Landscape and Visual	✓	✓

Topic Area	Original ES	ES Addendum
Marine Archaeology and Cultural Heritage	✓	✓
Commercial Fisheries	✓	✓
Airborne Noise	✓	x
Shipping and Navigation	✓	✓
Aviation	✓	x
Socio-Economics, Recreation and Tourism	✓	✓
Other Issues	✓	x

12. The specific scope of each technical assessment in this ES Addendum is defined within each technical assessment Section (5 to 14) for the relevant topic.

3.4 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

13. The assessment approach for the ES Addendum remains unchanged to that described in Section 4.2.4 of the Original ES.
14. An EIA involves the following main steps:
- Identification of baseline environmental conditions and establishing the sensitivity of receptors;
 - Avoiding potentially significant effects through the iterative design process and adoption of good practice measures (referred to as embedded mitigation);
 - Assessment of the significance of potential effects through the combination of the magnitude of an effect and sensitivity of the receptor/ resource;
 - Identification of mitigation measures to offset negative potentially significant effects; and
 - Assessment of the significance of residual effects following the application of mitigation measures.
15. Cumulative effects are also considered and assessed. A description of how cumulative effects have been addressed in this ES Addendum is presented in Section 3.6.
16. Finally, the EIA assesses both the:
- Routine effects resulting from planned activities of the Amended Project; and
 - Non-routine effects arising from unplanned or accidental events within the Amended Project.
17. The methodology used for the assessments in this ES Addendum is the same as that presented in Sections 4.2.5 to 4.2.9 of the Original ES, unless otherwise stated. Where technical specialists have used differing methodologies, these are presented within the technical assessment Sections 5 to 14.
18. Where any assessment in this ES Addendum results in a different significance of effect to the Original ES, this will be stated.

3.5 ASSESSMENT PARAMETERS

19. As outlined previously in this Section, this ES Addendum presents updated assessments of the topics set out Table 3.1, based on the range of parameters for the Amended Project presented in the Rochdale Envelope (Section 4: Amended Project Description). As in the Original ES, each technical discipline defines the worst case scenario from these parameters with regard to that technical discipline. The assessment is based on this worst case scenario.
20. A full description of the Rochdale Envelope approach is provided in Section 4.3 of the Original ES.
21. Further to the assessment, this ES Addendum presents a discussion of the most likely scenario for the Amended Project. The most likely scenario has been developed through the advancement of the concept design for the Project (although it is noted that the design cannot be finalised at this stage, so the consent applications must still be for the full Amended Project Rochdale Envelope). Where applicable, the technical sections of this ES Addendum describe the effects of the Amended Project in relation to the most likely scenario. This enables technical specialists to provide some context to their assessment findings against a possible scenario considered to be realistic by BOWL as opposed to a worst case. It also allows stakeholders to visualise what the overall effects of the Amended Project may be in reality, rather than combining the findings of all the worst case assessments.
22. For example, the Rochdale Envelope allows for four different foundation options: pin piles, suction piles, gravity bases or monopiles. For some assessments pin piles present the worst case with regard to potential effects, and in others gravity bases present the worst case. As such, some assessments have assumed the Wind Farm would be developed with 100% gravity bases, and some assume 100% pin piles. Therefore combining the results of these assessments present an impossible development scenario, as these two worst cases cannot both occur in the final design. The most likely scenario aims to assist the consultees in putting the worst case assessment findings into context.
23. The Rochdale Envelope parameters for the Amended Project and the most likely scenario are presented in Section 4: Amended Project Description.

3.5.1 INFORMATION GAPS

24. The information gaps discussed in Section 4.3.1 of the Original ES remain relevant for this ES Addendum. Any updates to the information gaps specific to technical assessments are presented in Sections 5 to 14.

3.6 ASSESSMENT OF CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

3.6.1 REQUIREMENT FOR ASSESSMENT OF CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

25. In line with the requirements of the EIA Regulations, an EIA must consider, and the ES must include, a description of the likely significant cumulative effects of a development. Cumulative effects and the methodologies used to assess cumulative

effects are the same as the Original ES, unless outlined as different in individual technical assessment sections of this ES Addendum.

26. The requirement for assessment of cumulative effects remains unchanged from that presented in Section 4.4.1 of the Original ES.

3.6.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS

27. The definition of terms related to the assessment of cumulative effects remains unchanged from that presented in Section 4.4.2 of the Original ES.

3.6.3 ASSESSMENT OF CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

28. Since the submission of the Original ES, a consent application has been submitted to Marine Scotland Licensing Operations Team (MS-LOT) for the development of the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone. The Zone is adjacent to the Wind Farm Site and due to its proximity and similar nature to the Amended Project it is a key consideration for the assessment of cumulative effects.
29. Where other developments have been considered for the assessment of cumulative effects, these are outlined in technical assessment Sections 9 to 30 of the Original ES.
30. The consent application for the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone contained further information than that which was available to BOWL for the cumulative assessment at the time of submission of the Original ES.
31. In some consultee responses, queries were raised relating to the cumulative effects of specific topic areas, those being: marine mammals, fish and shellfish ecology, ornithology and seascape, landscape and visual. Where required to address these comments, amended assessments of cumulative effects for the aforementioned receptors are included in this ES Addendum. The updates to the cumulative assessments include further and revised baseline data, revised modelling, clarifications on the approach to assessment and revised methodologies. The detail of how the assessment of cumulative effects has been revised within the ES Addendum is included in Sections 5 to 8.
32. The Moray Firth Round 3 Zone consent application also revealed further information on the phased approach to the development of the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone. The zone will be split into three wind farms. In order to take cognisance of this in cumulative assessments, an additive approach has been taken in this ES Addendum as follows:
- The Wind Farm plus Moray Firth Round 3 Zone MacColl Wind Farm;
 - The Wind Farm plus Moray Firth Round 3 Zone MacColl and Stevenson Wind Farms;
 - The Wind Farm plus Moray Firth Round 3 Zone MacColl, Stevenson and Telford Wind Farms.
33. This updates the former approach of assessing the cumulative effects of the Project against the whole of the Moray Firth Offshore Round 3 Zone.

3.7 HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (HRA)

34. In addition to updating the EIA, this ES Addendum also provides information to inform an Appropriate Assessment. The Report to Inform an Appropriate Assessment is included in Annex 3B. An HRA is a separate assessment to the EIA which focuses on the effects of the Amended Project on designated European sites.

3.8 CONSULTATION

35. Details of the pre-application consultation are provided in Section 5: Consultation of the Original ES, within the technical assessment Sections 9 to 30 of the Original ES and within Annex 5A: Summary of Consultation Responses of the Original ES.
36. The formal consultation period for the Original ES ended on 7th August 2012. Table 3.2 presents a summary of the representations received¹ during this period and comments made during ongoing meetings with key stakeholders such as Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). Where concerns and issues with the Original Project have been raised, it has been BOWL's aim to engage in constructive consultation to identify solutions where practical and possible.
37. These consultation responses have been responded to by BOWL in various ways. Where required, they are addressed by the further information provided within this ES Addendum. The responses have also in some cases been dealt with by letter, clarifying information presented in the Original ES issued direct to consultees and MS-LOT. Where these letters contained further information, they are referred to and contained within this ES Addendum. Where this is the case, it is noted in the consultation tables and not discussed further in this ES Addendum. These consultation letters can be obtained from MS-LOT on request. No further Project information has been provided in this manner. All assessment of the Amended Project and associated amendments to the EIA are presented in this ES Addendum.

Table 3.2: Post-Submission Consultation Summary

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Association of Salmon Fishery Boards (ASFB)	Concerns regarding the uncertainty surrounding the potential negative effects on Atlantic salmon and sea trout, and the integrity of a number of Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) for Atlantic salmon. This included a request for further information on electromagnetic fields (EMF).	See Section 5 of this ES Addendum. Further information on EMF is included in Section 4.3.4 and Section 5 of this ES Addendum.
Bond Offshore Helicopters	No comments.	No response required.

Table continued on next page

¹ Representations were also received from the public. These will be dealt with through ongoing public consultation events and provision of information.

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Bristow Helicopters	No objection. Views should be sought from Ithaca Energy, Wood Group and Talisman Energy.	Ithaca, Wood Group and Talisman were contacted by MS-LOT as part of the consultation exercise. Therefore, no response required.
British Telecom (BT)	No objection.	No response required.
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	Need to seek views from MOD, NATS, aerodromes and offshore helicopters. Need to notify UK Hydrographic Office (UKHO) of turbine and met mast locations and heights pre-construction. Response also sets out lighting requirements for turbines and met masts.	Noted. No current action required. MOD, NATS, aerodromes and offshore helicopters were contacted by MS-LOT as part of the consultation exercise.
Chamber of Shipping	Comment on shipping and navigation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collaboration between BOWL and the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone developers; • operational safety zones; and • anchoring in Spey Bay. 	Consultation directly with Chamber of Shipping outwith this ES Addendum as detailed in Section 13 of this ES Addendum.
CHC Helicopters	No response to date.	No action required.
Historic Scotland	No objection. Consider the effect on Dunbeath Castle, a Category A listed building to be of 'minor' significance as opposed to 'negligible'. Recommend implementation of the Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (Offshore Renewables Projects).	Response submitted to Historic Scotland outwith this ES Addendum as detailed in Section 11 of this ES Addendum.
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)	No comment.	No response required.

Table continued on next page

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Ithaca Energy (on behalf of Ithaca Energy, Talisman [UK] Ltd and Wood Group PSN)	Initially responded with queries relating to restrictions on helicopter access and supply boat access, requested 5km separation from any mobile drilling rig or barge, issues with space for decommissioning. Following a meeting between BOWL, Ithaca, Wood Group and Talisman, Ithaca have no objection subject to a 2.5 km exclusion zone around the Jacky oil platform (for turbines, offshore substation platforms and meteorological masts) and no export cables within 1.5 km of Beatrice Bravo or Jacky oil platforms.	BOWL has agreed to the 2.5 km exclusion zone around the Jacky platform and the 1.5 km buffer around the Bravo platform. The Original OfTW Corridor has been widened to accommodate the export cable buffer. The amendment to the Original OfTW Corridor is addressed in Sections 5 to 14 of this ES Addendum.
Joint Radio Company (JRC)	No objection. Requested they are re-consulted when the design and layout is finalised in case of network alterations.	Noted. No current action required.
Marine Scotland Compliance	No comments.	No response required.

Table continued on next page

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Marine Scotland Science (MSS)	<p>Technical comments primarily relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sections 11 and 23: Fish and Shellfish Ecology; Sections 16 and 27: Commercial Fisheries; and Sections 9 and 21: Physical Processes and Geomorphology. <p>Comments were also received relating to Sections 4: EIA Process and Methodology, 6: Site Selection and Consideration of Alternatives, 7: Project Description, 8: Designated Sites and Legislation, 10 and 22: Benthic Ecology of the Original ES.</p> <p>The comments on fish and shellfish ecology included a request for further information on EMF.</p>	<p>Comments addressed within Sections 5, 9 and 12 of this ES Addendum and through further consultation outwith this ES Addendum.</p> <p>The ecological effect of EMFs is an important issue and both the offshore wind industry and regulators recognise the need for improved understanding in this field. Some electrosensitive species have electroreceptors which allow them to detect Induced Electric fields (E_i) at close range which is used to detect other marine creatures. Furthermore, electroreceptive species react to E in order to navigate or deduce their depth in the ocean.</p> <p>Other electrosensitive species which do not possess electroreceptors are able to detect E_i caused by the earth's magnetic field (B) which allows them to sense water movements and tidal conditions (CMACS, 2003).</p> <p>Further information on EMF is included in Section 4.3.4, Section 5 and Section 6 of this ES Addendum.</p>

Table continued on next page

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	<p>Require BOWL to forward bathymetry data so can complete assessment.</p> <p>Issue with how Anatec have approached provision of emergency options.</p> <p>Require detailed emergency response plan prior to construction commencing.</p>	<p>BOWL forwarded bathymetry data to MCA. MCA have forwarded to UKHO.</p> <p>Agreement with MCA that emergency options will be discussed further prior to construction and no amendment to ES or Navigation Risk Assessment required.</p> <p>No current actions required on emergency response plan, this would be developed upon gaining consent.</p>
Ministry of Defence (MOD)	Objection. The turbines will be in line of sight of the air traffic control radar at RAF Lossiemouth.	Ongoing consultation with the MOD outwith this ES Addendum.
Moray Firth Partnership	<p>Information about the consultation has been forwarded to a number of other organisations who would respond to MS-LOT directly.</p> <p>Informal feedback received from members by Moray Firth Partnership relating to concerns about potential effects on wildlife, visual and tourism impact. Individual responses would be submitted by members rather than from the Moray Firth Partnership.</p>	No response required.
Moray Firth Sea Trout Project	Object to the proposal, request a monitoring strategy and mitigation proposals. Comments relating to noise, EMF, loss of habitat and disturbance of prey and predators.	Ongoing consultation with Moray Firth Sea Trout Project, in conjunction with MSS, outwith this ES Addendum.
Moray Offshore Renewables Ltd (MORL)	<p>Opposition maintained to the Project as the OfTW cable route runs through the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone Western Development Area.</p> <p>Notes that key parameters of the Moray Firth Round 3 Zone Rochdale Envelope have been changed since the BOWL consent application submission which may lead to an inaccurate and different portrayal of cumulative effects.</p> <p>Highlight that there may be differences in cumulative effects over and above this due to the fact that MORL has taken a more quantitative approach to some assessments than BOWL.</p>	<p>Updated cumulative information for Moray Firth Round 3 Zone has been incorporated throughout the ES Addendum.</p> <p>A more quantitative approach is presented within the assessment of effects on marine mammals in Section 6 of this ES Addendum.</p>

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
NATS (En Route) Plc (NERL)	Objection. The Wind Farm conflicts with NERL's safeguarding criteria.	Ongoing consultation with NERL outwith this ES Addendum.
Northern Lighthouse Board (NLB)	No objection. Further consultation required to confirm final lighting specifications.	Noted. Ongoing consultation will be maintained with NLB outwith this ES Addendum as detailed in Section 13 of this ES Addendum.
Ports and Harbours-Transport Scotland	No comments.	No response required.
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	Object pending the supply of information on the current breeding status and trends of various seabirds associated with the Special Protection Areas (SPAs), to facilitate Appropriate Assessment. Further comments relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data used for SPA populations; • Assessment approach; • Cumulative assessment scope; and • Avian radar studies. 	Comments have been addressed within Section 7 of this ES Addendum and through direct consultation with RSPB.
Royal Yachting Association (RYA) Scotland	No objection. Two specific queries on wording in the Original ES.	Addressed through direct consultation with RYA Scotland outwith this ES Addendum as detailed in Section 13 of this ES Addendum.
Scottish Canoe Association	No comments.	No response required.
Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)	Requested measures to minimise the risk of introducing marine non-native species are included within Environmental Management Plan (EMP).	Noted. A draft EMP is provided in Annex 3A of this ES Addendum. No further response required.
Scottish Fishermen's Federation (SFF)	General concern that the Original ES does not address impacts on the local fishing industry but assesses on a national scale which dilutes the impacts. Will not oppose the Project if it realistically attempts to ameliorate its negative impacts on the fishing industry.	Ongoing consultation with SFF outwith this ES Addendum.

Table continued on next page

Organisation	Response	Action/ Reference to Response
Surfers Against Sewage	Concerned that not all surf receptors have been considered, suggest further consultation with Surfers Against Sewage, Scottish Surfing Federation and Surfing GB. Also have concerns regarding statements made in OfTW Socio-economics, Recreation and Tourism Section of Original ES regarding surf spots and coastal processes.	A letter response has been issued to Surfers Against Sewage which is included in Annex 9B to this ES Addendum.
The Crown Estate	No comments.	No response required.
The Highland Council (THC)	Comments relating to the THC Standard visualisations (provided to THC outwith the Original ES).	A revised set of visualisations have been provided to THC outwith this ES Addendum. ²
The Moray Council	No objection.	No response required.
Transport Scotland	No objection.	No response required.
University of Aberdeen	University of Aberdeen declined to comment due to their involvement in the preparation of the Original ES.	No response required.
Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (WDCS)	Do not object to the proposal provided specific conditions are implemented relating to creating an effective monitoring strategy. Also commented on specific sections of the marine mammal assessment.	BOWL has sought to address comments within Section 6 of this ES Addendum and through direct consultation with WDCS.

3.9 POST SUBMISSION MEETINGS

38. Following receipt of the consultation responses, there have been a number of meetings between BOWL, the EIA Team, stakeholders and MS-LOT to develop an approach for addressing the issues raised, to the extent appropriate, in this ES Addendum. A summary of the key meetings relevant to this ES Addendum are provided below. Following each meeting, a list of minutes and actions was prepared and agreed by all attendees to agree on how the issues raised would be addressed within this ES Addendum.
39. In addition, topic-specific technical discussions have taken place following these meetings to inform the scope of this ES Addendum. Details on these and full details on other consultation findings, and how they have been addressed are detailed within technical assessment Sections 4 to 14.

² Further information regarding THC Standard visualisations and consultation is provided in Section 8: Seascape, Landscape and Visual

3.9.1 MEETING WITH MS-LOT, 15TH AUGUST 2012

40. A meeting was held between BOWL, MS-LOT, Dundas & Wilson (BOWL's legal advisor on consenting issues) and Arcus on the 15th August 2012 to discuss the consultation responses received regarding the Original ES. The main points of discussion were: the use of the Rochdale Envelope approach, cumulative impacts, total impacts i.e. for the project as a whole across all technical disciplines, European Protected Species (EPS) and HRA. Specific technical issues were discussed including ornithology, marine mammals, and SLVIA. The key action from the meeting was to organise further consultation meetings with stakeholders, in particular SNH, to discuss the approach for the specific issues.

3.9.2 MEETING WITH MS-LOT AND SNH, 17TH AUGUST 2012 & 27TH AUGUST 2012

41. A meeting was held between BOWL, SNH, MS-LOT, Dundas & Wilson and Arcus on the 17th August 2012 to discuss SNH's comments on the Original ES. The main points of discussion were: the Rochdale Envelope approach, and issues regarding specific technical assessment areas including ornithology, SLVIA, fish, details of the construction programme, HRA and EPS. Subsequently it was recognised that further information and a number of meetings with the specific technical specialists would be required.
42. A meeting was held between BOWL, MS-LOT, MSS and Arcus on the 27th August 2012 to discuss consultation comments, progress to date and further action required. The proposed structure of this ES Addendum was introduced along with the approach to be taken to discuss the technical issues with SNH through a series of further meetings.

3.9.3 MEETING WITH SNH AND MS-LOT, 4TH SEPTEMBER 2012: ORNITHOLOGY

43. A meeting was held between BOWL, SNH, MS-LOT, Arcus and MacArthur Green on the 4th September 2012 to discuss ornithology comments from SNH relating to the Original ES. Actions of the meeting were to produce an action plan for addressing any comments and to define a scope of further work to be undertaken and included in this ES Addendum (see Section 7.2).

3.9.4 MEETING WITH SNH AND MS-LOT, 6TH SEPTMEBER 2012: MARINE MAMMALS

44. A meeting was held between BOWL, SNH, MS-LOT, Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC), RPS, Dundas & Wilson and Arcus on the 6th September 2012 to discuss marine mammal comments raised by SNH in relation to the Original ES. Actions of the meeting were to produce an action plan for addressing any comments and to define a scope of further work to be undertaken and included in this ES Addendum (see Section 6.2).

3.9.5 MEETING WITH SNH AND MS-LOT, 26TH SEPTMEBER 2012: SLVIA

45. A meeting was held between BOWL, SNH, MS-LOT, LDA Design and Arcus on the 26th September 2012 to discuss SLVIA comments raised by SNH in relation to the Original ES. Actions of the meeting were to produce an action plan for addressing any comments and to define a scope of further work to be undertaken and included in this ES Addendum (see Section 8.2).

3.9.6 MEETING WITH SNH AND MS-LOT, 5TH OCTOBER 2012: FISH

46. A meeting was held between BOWL, SNH, MS-LOT, MSS, Brown & May Marine and Arcus on the 5th October 2012 to discuss comments relating to fish raised by SNH and MSS in relation to the Original ES. Actions of the meeting were to produce an action plan for addressing any comments and to define a scope of further work to be undertaken and included in this ES Addendum (see Section 5.2).

3.10 REFERENCES

47. CMACS (2003) A baseline assessment of electromagnetic fields generated by offshore windfarm cables. COWRIE 2003

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK