



Forth and Tay Offshore Wind Developers Group (FTOWDG)

## **FTOWDG Commercial Fisheries Working Group: Meeting Note**

**Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> October 2015**

**Jurys Inn, Edinburgh**

### **Attendees:**

Rosie Scurr (Mainstream – Neart na Gaoithe) (Chair)  
Nick Brockie (SSE Renewables - Seagreen)  
Tom Young (Repsol – Inch Cape)  
Esther Villoria (Repsol – Inch Cape)  
Courtney French (Brown and May Marine)  
John Watt (Scottish Fishermen's Federation)  
Malcolm Morrison (Scottish Fishermen's Federation)  
Stephen Small (Pittenweem Fisherman)  
Sandy Ritchie (Anglo Scottish Fishermen's Association) (Vice Chair)  
Iain Maddox (Dunbar Fisherman's association)  
John Hermse (Scallop Association)  
John Davidson (Fishermen's Mutual Pittenweem)  
Bruce Buchanan (Marine Scotland Policy)  
Roger May (Marine Scotland Licensing)  
Andronikas Kafas (Marine Scotland Science)  
Matt Frow (Seafish - Kingfisher)  
Marc Murray (2-B Energy)

**Apologies:** Jacqui Karakaya (Cockenzie and Port Seaton), Billy Hughes (Fishermen's Mutual Pittenweem), Neil Teviotdale (Arbroath)

### **Agenda**

1. Introductions including new Chair and Vice Chair.
2. Sign off of previous meeting minutes
3. Project updates
4. SeaFish - Discussion of Dropped Objects
5. 2-B Energy Introduction & Project Update
6. Shared Position Statement
7. Fisheries Heat Mapping
8. AOB
9. Wind farm visit Logistics

## 1. Introduction

1. RS introduced herself as the new Chair of the FTOWDG CFWG and Sandy Ritchie as the Vice Chair.

## 2. Previous minutes

2. RS explained that all comments submitted have been incorporated and suggested running through the actions.

### Actions from previous minutes

3. Action point 12 (AK to put the scallop and *Nephrops* survey results on drop box) - AK to send Scallop and Nephrops survey results to CF to put onto DropBox.
4. Action point 13 (CF to organise a trip to a wind farm in late April 2015) - wind farm visit to take place on 30<sup>th</sup> October 2015 in Ramsgate.
5. Action point 15- AK to upload charts of VMS/Fishing Grounds to DropBox.
6. Action point 35- Fishermen's representatives to ensure the Fishermen's list is up to date.
7. Action point 67 (BMM to draft a proposal to develop a dropped objects protocol, and distribute for comment) - BMM have drafted proposal for dropped objects protocol, now need to draw up protocol.
8. Action point 70- Developers to draft Fisheries Communication Plan.
9. Action point 71 (RM to send the Socio Economic Study scoping report to CF to distribute to the CFWG, or upload it to drop box) - Bruce Buchanan is now in charge of Marine Scotland Socio Economic scoping report.
10. Action point 78- (Developers to consider demand for fisheries awareness course) – NB organised a fisheries awareness course, RS and TY to consider the demand for their project teams.

### Discussion on previous minutes

11. Action point 35- Fishermen's register.
  - BB stated that for Marine Scotland (MS) to release contact details to the developers/BMM, the fishermen would need to sign a data release form. AK explained that there could be a way for MS to distribute information from the developers by district (i.e. only to Forth and Tay area).
  - SS stated that information from developers should be sent separately from MS licence variation notices.
  - CF explained that BMM/developers have a database of fishermen's details (contact number, email and postal address), but need to ensure it is up to date.
  - MM stated that MS can send a letter on the behalf of the developers to fishermen naming the project FIRs. This letter will need to be signed and returned to BMM for them to receive information from the developers.
12. Action point 69- Heat maps and overtrawlability gates.
  - AK explained that MS and SFF had a meeting to discuss fishing grounds, heat maps and how to determine where overtrawlability gates should be. However, it became apparent that MS data and SFF data are incompatible.
  - IM highlighted that there are numerous vessels whose fishing grounds are not represented by VMS/ AIS/ ScotMap/ UKFIM. Frequency of fishing activity is also important, not just vessel tracks. IM stated that developers often make statements regarding low fishing activity in areas, but that may not be the case, because the datasets do not represent all fishing vessels. IM stated that he could introduce his contact who was looking at transforming the data into a usable

format to the developers.

- JW stated that SFF cannot make a decision of where the overtrawlability gates should go, the fishermen need to make that decision. There may be less resistance than the oil and gas industry. If the cable is buried properly, fishermen may be able to trawl over the entire cable, not only the gates.
- MM stated that if a couple of vessels have Sedina installed which are currently not represented by UKFIM or ScotMap, their vessels data would be representative of those vessels with no electronic data.
- IM suggested that the fishermen he represents could draw where they do not fish, where they fish sometimes and where they fish regularly, this could help with the planning process for upcoming developments.
- RS stated that the developers should be involved in the process of deciding where the gates should be.

13. Action point 70- Fisheries Communication Plan:

- RS stated that each developer will have a communication plan in the CFMS which is a condition of the Marine Licence.

14. Action point 71- Socio Economic study Marine Scotland:

- BB stated that MS had been planning a study on which fishing methods could continue within an operational windfarm, potential reef affects. However, The Crown Estate has done a study of the impacts of wind farms on fishing in the Irish Sea and are about to start a second study in the Wash. A SPORRAN fisheries group are also undertaking similar research. Therefore MS are holding off the study until the Crown Estate results are published before they continue the study.

**Actions**

15. Developers to draft a letter for MS to fishermen naming their FIRs. This letter will need to be signed by the fisherman and returned to BMM for them to receive further information regarding the project.

16. MS/ SFF to distribute the heat map of fishing grounds.

### 3. Project Updates

#### Neart Na Gaoithe

17. RS explained that there is no clarity as to when the Judicial Review (JR) decision will be made. However, NnG received CfD and therefore have had to push forward with a couple of things, such as a bathymetric survey. NnG have contracted Siemens, Prysmian and GeoSea. Financial close is end of March 2016. Construction onshore is due to commence June 2016, offshore construction is due to commence at the end of 2016 through to 2019.

#### Seagreen

18. NB stated that Seagreen is currently awaiting the JR outcome and the next steps will be decided once this is known.

#### Inch Cape

19. TY explained that Inch Cape is now 100% owned by Repsol. Inch Cape carried out onshore survey work in Spring 2015. Inch Cape are also waiting on JR decision. The installation of the met mast was completed in October 2015, final commissioning and testing is expected to be completed in coming months. A wave buoy was installed 2 months ago. Evaluation of engineering design contractors is ongoing and expected to be completed early 2016. Inch Cape are awaiting an announcement from Government on the details of the next CfD round. Expect that construction will commence in the middle of 2018. Further geophys and geotech survey work is expected in 2016.

### 4. SeaFish Dropped Objects Discussion

20. MF introduced himself and explained that he works for Seafish. Seafish are responsible for Kingfisher bulletins, KisORCA and Fishsafe. MF provided a document regarding dropped objects (appended).
21. MF explained that FLOWW have discussed the dropped objects topic and whether lessons could be learned from the Oil and Gas dropped object procedure and look to implement for renewables - an equivalent of a PON 2 Form.
22. MF stated that the key importance of the reporting dropped objects is to reduce the risk to vessel safety. DECC states that dropped objects should be reported within 6 hours of losing an object. Dropped objects are made available to vessel owners by Fishsafe biannual updates (10 formats), KIS-ORCA annual updates (10 formats), Kingfisher bulletin and twitter feed. DECC request that all possible endeavours should be undertaken to recover the dropped object. If an object is recovered, they are removed from the Fishsafe database. Marine Scotland need to incorporate a similar system for renewables.
23. JW explained that a high proportion of PON 2 Forms are within a safety zone of oil and gas infrastructure. The key concern for fishermen regarding dropped objects by renewables is that safety zones will be rolling (around construction vessels), and therefore less likely to know where the dropped object is, and more likely to cause a snagging incident.
24. MF stated that there needs to be an obligation on developers to ensure recovered dropped objects are also recorded (i.e. a second form to fill in should the item be recovered).
25. AK stated that there should also be a requirement to prove that any dropped object recovery has been attempted.

26. BB stated that the equivalent of PON 2 forms for renewables will be submitted to MS.
27. JW stated that sometimes it can take 4 days until the PON 2 data is available for fishermen, if that area is heavily fished, it may have already caused a snagging incident.
28. NB explained that there is a dropped objects condition in the marine licence for the developments which requires recovery. The matter would have to be dealt with by developers to discharge this condition.
29. JW explained that if a fisherman snags his gear on a dropped object which is reported on the fish safe system, they will not be able to claim for the snagged gear.
30. BB stated that dropped objects are briefly mentioned in the FLOWW guidelines and is on the agenda to be discussed at the next FLOWW meeting.
31. MF explained that there is a googlemap on the KIS-ORCA website which shows where all of the dropped objects are.
32. JD stated that MS should ensure that there is a robust system for the reporting of dropped objects to protect all vessels and users of the sea.
33. MF explained that good communication is key. It is one thing recording such information, it is essential that relevant channels of communication are used to report dropped objects to industry and also when they have been recovered. Examples of these key contacts are: Kingfisher – Seafish, Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Scottish Fishermen's Federation, National Federations of Fishermen's Organisations, etc.
34. RS commented that dropped objects are mentioned in the consent decisions.
  - The relevant consent conditions for NnG are as follows: 3.2.3.3 and 3.2.3.4 in the cable route Marine Licence and 3.2.2.1 and 3.2.2.2 and 3.2.3.3 in the wind farm Marine Licence.
  - The relevant consent conditions for Inch Cape are as follows: "If the Licensee becomes aware of any substances or objects on the transportation audit sheet that are missing, or an accidental deposit occurs, the Licensee must contact the Licensing Authority as soon as practicable after becoming aware, for advice on the appropriate remedial action. Should the Licensing Authority deem it necessary, the Licensee must undertake a side scan sonar survey in grid lines (within operational and safety constraints) across the area of the Works, to include cable routes and vessel access routes from local service port(s) to the Site to locate the substances or objects. If the Licensing Authority is of the view that any accidental deposits associated with the construction of the Works are present, then the deposits must be removed by the Licensee as soon as is practicable and at the Licensee's expense."
  - The relevant consent conditions for Alpha and Bravo OWF are as follows: condition 3.2.2.1 Transport Audit Sheet for the construction period and also in the OfTW marine licence at condition 3.2.3.3.



Forth and Tay Offshore Wind Developers Group (FTOWDG)

**Actions**

35. BMM to draft dropped objects form to developers for discussion with MS.

## 5. 2-B Energy Update

36. Marc Murray (MMu) stated that he works for 2-B Energy.
37. MMu explained that 2-B Energy is an active offshore wind turbine technology company based in Hengelo, the Netherlands and Aberdour in Fife. The company was founded in 2007 and, in partnership with a reputable network of key partners in the industry, has developed an innovative, new design for offshore wind turbines. 2-B Energy's ambition is to commercialise a new approach to offshore wind turbine design and become a leading offshore wind technology supplier, with a significant Scottish contribution. Further information on 2-B Energy can be obtained from [www.2benergy.com](http://www.2benergy.com).
38. MMu explained that Forthwind Ltd (a wholly owned subsidiary of 2-B Energy Ltd) have applied to Marine Scotland to develop a facility for the demonstration of a new design of offshore wind turbine on the northern shore of the Firth of Forth at Methil, Scotland. The project, known as the Forthwind Demonstration Site, is located approximately 1.5 km seaward of the mean high water springs (MHWS) as shown below. The demonstration facility would see the introduction of a new type of offshore wind technology, the 2B6 (6MW) turbine, which has a design life of 40 years (however, consent has only been applied for 20 years). The proposal is to install, commission and operate 2 turbines in 2017 to prove the full turbine design in an offshore environment and to obtain certification and validation of the turbine design and technology.
39. MMu explained that 2-B Energy have Crown Estate Agreement for Lease for 2 turbines. There will be 2 separate cable routes and the transformer will be separate due to the expense. 2-B Energy have a pre-planned overhaul every 10 years including refurb of nacelle, rotor etc. MMu stated that at least one turbine will have helicopter access.
40. MMu explained that cable installation will take up to 15 days, foundation piling will take up to 40 days, turbine installation will take up to 10 days, however, in reality it will probably take less time than this.
41. MMu questioned what the best way is for 2-B Energy to engage with the fishing industry.
42. RS stated that the other developers of FTOWDG believe that it is not the best way forward to bring 2-B Energy into the group as they are a much smaller project and also at a different stage in the process.
43. JD stated that only VMS data has been utilised in the ES chapter, and reiterated the points outlined previously regarding lack of data for smaller vessels. There was a distinct lack of consultation with the fishermen.
44. MM stated that consultation needs to be undertaken whether it is 2 turbines or 200 turbines.
45. RM suggested that it may be beneficial for 2-B Energy come to an agreement with the fishermen regarding the location of the turbines prior to MS issuing consent, as this may prevent the requirement for consent conditions.

### Actions

46. CF to send MMu the contact details for the members of the CFWG.

## 6. Discussion on Shared Position Statement

47. TY questioned if all of the fishing industry is happy for MM and SR to sign the Shared Position Statement (SPS) on their behalf.
48. All are happy for the SPS to be signed by MM and SR.
49. Wrong version of SPS was printed for signature at meeting.

### Actions

50. BMM to send most recent SPS to MM and SR to sign.

## 7. Heat Mapping

51. RS stated that the FTOWDG developers would like the outputs of the meetings between SFF and MS regarding the heat mapping for the overtrawlability gates.
52. NB restated that a decision on such gates was for the developers and would require considerable further design work following a successful JR outcome before any agreement could be discussed.

### Actions

53. SFF and MS to send any outputs of meetings to the FTOWDG developers.

## 8. AOB

54. MM explained that he has provided a paper outlining what the fishermen want with regards to a community fund. MM stated that the fishing industry is the only offshore industry that will be impacted by the wind farms.
55. RS questioned if this community fund is on top of individual disruption payments.
56. MM explained that the SFF believe the community fund should be on top of any disruption payments to individuals, and that the FIRs should sit on the board to determine how the community fund is spent.
57. RS explained that the funding for the project has not been finalised yet, and therefore cannot commit to a community fund.
58. TY stated that Inch Cape is further behind NnG in regards to funding, and reiterated that disruption for individuals and a community fund should be discussed separately. Inch Cape are willing to discuss ideas for funding but cannot commit at this time.
59. NB outlined that a community fund is not a requirement of the consent, any discussion of this needs to wait until the JR outcome is known and developers have more clarity on the way forward.
60. JH stated that coming to an agreement regarding compensation and community funds will take time, and therefore discussions need to take place well in advance of the commencement of construction.
61. IM suggested not having so long between CFWG meetings as there has been a large amount to get through today.
62. Next meeting proposed March 2016.





Forth and Tay Offshore Wind Developers Group (FTOWDG)

## 9. Wind Farm Logistics

63. Visit organised by Mainstream and Repsol to Thanet Windfarm departing from Ramsgate. The final logistics were discussed to ensure all attending were happy with arrangements.

### Actions

64. John Hermse and Phil Gilmore to provide NOK forms to Brown and May ahead of site visit.