

Subject	Forth and Tay Commercial Fisheries Working Group (CFWG) Meeting		
Meeting location	Radisson Collection, 1 George Bridge IV Bridge, Edinburgh, EH1 1AD		
Meeting date	20 Aug 2018	Minutes by	Fiona Nimmo
		Date issued	09 November 2018
Attendees	<p>Rosie Scurr, RS (EDF Renewables – NnG project)</p> <p>Tom Young, TY (Red Rock - Inch Cape project)</p> <p>Nick Brockie, NB (SSE - Seagreen project)</p> <p>Natalie Stephenson, NS (Natural Power – consultant to Inch Cape)</p> <p>Lis Royle, LR (SSE – Seagreen project)</p> <p>Jonathan Keer, JK (Brown and May Marine – consultant to Seagreen)</p> <p>Fiona Nimmo, FN (Poseidon – consultant to NnG)</p> <p>Neil Teviotdale, NT (fisherman, Arbroath and Montrose Fishermen’s Association)</p> <p>Malcolm Morrison, MM (SFF)</p> <p>Raymond Hall, RH (SFF)</p> <p>Roger May, RM (Marine Scotland)</p> <p>Andronikos Kafas, AK (Marine Scotland)</p> <p>Iain Maddox, IM (N&E RIFG)</p> <p>Femke de Boer, FdB (SWFPA)</p> <p>Peter Johnstone, PJ (DFA / SCFA)</p> <p>Sandra Turnbull, ST (Under 10m Assoc.)</p> <p>Jacqui Karakaya, JK (Port Seaton Fishermen’s Association)</p> <p>Tommy Finn, TF (fisherman, Dunbar Fishermen’s Association and Community Inshore Fishermen’s Alliance)</p> <p>Phil Gilmour, PG (Marine Scotland)</p> <p>Marc Murray, MM (Cierco – Forthwind project)</p>		<p>Sandy Ritchie, SR (Anglo-Scottish)</p> <p>Heather Donald, HD (SSE – Seagreen project)</p> <p>Stephen Small, SS (fisherman / Pittenweem FMA)</p>
			Apologies
Distribution	Attendees + Apologies		

Meeting objectives

Meeting Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) (1) Re-establishment CFWG (2) (2) Agreement of positions in, and administration, of group (3) (3) Agreement on group membership / attendance (4) (4) Project updates

Objectives Met
All meeting objective were delivered

Meeting minutes

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
01	<p>Welcome and introductions</p> <p>Individuals provide round table introductions.</p>		
02	<p>Safety Moment</p> <p>RS provided Safety Moment about the importance of keeping hydrated</p>		
03	<p>Re-establishment of CFWG – objectives, history, name change</p> <p>RS introduced re-establishment of the group. The last meeting was held a couple of years ago, and the group previously met quarterly or biannually. The objective of the group is to bring all commercial fisheries stakeholders together to discuss the three offshore wind farm projects: NnG, Inch Cape and Seagreen.</p> <p>The group was previously put on hold due to the judicial review. Marine Scotland was successful in their appeal, so all projects are confirmed to be moving forward. NnG has a contract for difference (CFD) and is progressing to construction, and Seagreen and Inch Cape are each working towards obtaining a CFD.</p> <p>Currently all three projects have submitted new consents applications which look at different technologies that have now become available.</p> <p>The group is confirmed to be called the Forth and Tay Commercial Fisheries Working Group.</p>		
04	<p>Terms of Reference (ToR)</p> <p>The <u>Terms of Reference</u> (ToR) for the group were originally written in 2012. RS sought comments on the ToR. MM confirmed SFF have responded on the ToR and provided a number of comments that were submitted at the end of 2017 and passed to developers. In general, they find the ToR to be written from a developer’s perspective and not balanced for the working group.</p> <p>ST suggested including monitoring within ToR as in there as an objective of the group. MM considered this should be an outcome rather than an objective.</p> <p>ACTION: Developers to review SFF comments on ToR.</p> <p><u>Frequency of meetings</u> is agreed to be twice annually when not busy, potentially moving to quarterly when activity increases for the projects. It is noted that individual project consultation is on-going separately from this working group.</p> <p>NB noted that project design updates and other projects will be moving at different times. Project specific aspects should be dealt with by project specific consultation.</p> <p>RH noted that the projects are likely to have elements of overlapping construction, so there is a need to plan for that early, with regard to fisheries impacts.</p> <p><u>Discrete subgroups</u>, e.g. cables sub group are discussed. It is considered that sub-groups take additional time, and topics are better contained within one group.</p> <p>NS proposed sub-groups work on things remotely, via email and come back to report to the group. RH considered it best not to have this approach with preference to keep everything open.</p> <p>NT notes that the wind farm site is often not a big concern, but the cables are an issue, and different projects go to different landfall e.g., Torness, Carnoustie and Port Seaton, so associated issues would be better voiced by those that have an interest in those areas. TY confirmed that would be considered as project specific consultation.</p>		

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
	<p>AK noted that if the issue is cumulative across projects, then it becomes an agenda item. If additional work needed, then someone takes an action and presents back to the group. Previous experience from FLOWW is that sub-groups fade out. Therefore, he advised no sub-groups.</p> <p>It is agreed not to operate sub-groups. It is agreed meetings will be twice annually, and quarterly when necessary. It is agreed that the opportunity for fishermen to have prior meetings is welcomed and will remain.</p>		
05	<p>Election of Chair / Vice Chair</p> <p>RS is current acting chair and SR vice chair. Both confirmed they are happy to continue these roles.</p> <p>The group confirm they are happy with the current chair and vice chair positions and to review annually.</p>		
06	<p>Group administration / secretariat</p> <p>RS confirmed the secretariat role will rotate among the developers, supported by their commercial fisheries consultants. Therefore, attendees should expect invites from different commercial fisheries consultants for these group meetings.</p> <p>Note that MM remains happy to observe at present and not act as a meeting organiser. RM from MS-LOT agreed to send info / updates directly to chair RS.</p> <p>Noted used dropbox previously for minutes, with suggestion that web based would be more accessible. The group agreed that having minutes available online would be a very good way to disseminate information.</p> <p>JK suggested a backup for those that don't use a computer, e.g. 1-page A4 sheet to hand out across ports, harbours to fishermen.</p> <p>The group agreed that an annual or 6-month newsletter would be helpful.</p> <p>ACTION: developers to agree who leads development of such a newsletter.</p>	RS, NB, TY	By next meeting
07	<p>Membership / attendance</p> <p>Developer presence at the Inshore Fisheries Conference is discussed, but noted out of 100 attendees last year, only 20 were fishermen, so would not provide a sufficient opportunity to reach out to and inform fishermen.</p> <p>The group discuss the idea of the three developers undertaking a consultation roadshow across ports/harbours. It is noted that individual projects will do this as part of their project specific consultation, and this will be across different phases as the project develop. The group agreed that there is not a great deal of value to be obtained for this group having a roadshow across the region.</p> <p>RH noted that fishermen affected by NnG are completely different from those affected by Seagreen and the importance of making sure everyone is aware of what is going on. It is the same grounds being targeted across all harbours when mobile gear is involved, so need to involve them all. Keep everyone updated. This will be done by disseminating information from the Working Group meetings and project FLOs and FIRs.</p> <p>Each FIR will have a network of local fishermen that they would disseminate information to. RH and JK agreed FIRs need to be neutral and distribute information to all fishermen (members of associations, federations and non-affiliated).</p> <p>It is noted that scallop fishermen are represented on a number of national associations and federations. It is suggested that SFF can assist in ensuring non-local (nomadic) scallop fishermen are updated. MM confirmed there are two major Scottish groups representing scallops and one of them is member of SFF, so SFF can ensure the other group are also informed and updated.</p> <p>For this meeting a blanket invite was sent to everyone and the attendance was good.</p>		

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
	<p>Intention going forward would be for the following attendance: 3 FIRs, Marine Scotland, developers, and company FLOs.</p> <p>MM considered it important for the working group to have harbour/area fishermen’s representatives as well e.g., reps from fishermen’s associations for Port Seaton, Arbroath, Dunbar etc.</p> <p>The group discussed the difference between FIRs for the working group and FIRs for each project. It is suggested that FIRs for the working group might be area representatives, that feedback details to the fishermen in the geographic area they represent (termed “Area Representatives”). While project FIRs are focused on project specific consultation; it is also noted that each project may have a number of FIRs, e.g., Inch Cape expect to have three FIRs. It may be the case that the project FIRs and Area Reps are the same individuals with different roles.</p> <p>It is noted that RS and TY have not yet assigned FIRs for NnG and Inch Cape.</p> <p>Noted that previously FIRs have been paid through SFF Services Ltd from administrative perspective, does not mean the rep is affiliated with SFF.</p> <p>There is some disagreement within the group. RH considered it is for industry to decide appropriate reps. ST found it difficult to see the balance in meetings if only three Area Reps representing industry attended the Working Group meetings. ST agreed that harbour reps should be in attendance as well.</p> <p>The fishing industry group agreed that all fisheries representatives here should still attend together with FIRs and company FLOs.</p> <p>JK noted the focus to be on efficiency. RS expressed concern that membership numbers might become unworkable. Work in progress, make sure every port is represented. Noted that the previous incarnation was not hampered by having harbour reps and FIRs together. Good exercise that message is coming across. Time might show that ARs are representing harbour areas.</p> <p>The group consider terminology confusing and prefer use of FIRs, perhaps appropriate to be Area FIRs and Project FIRs to distinguish roles.</p> <p>SR is vice chair on presumption that he is area representative for south but, with SR absence, that would need to be confirmed.</p> <p>It is agreed that, for now, membership shall remain as it currently stands, i.e., developers, SFF, relevant harbour fishing industry groups/associations, Area FIRs / Project FIRs when and as appointed.</p> <p>ACTION: developers agree to give further thought to definition and requirement for separate Area FIRs and Project FIRs.</p> <p>ACTION: fishing industry to provide list of candidate FIRs.</p>	<p>RS, NB, TY</p> <p>Industry members</p>	<p>By next meeting</p> <p>ASAP</p>
08	<p>Fishing Industry members and FIRs (including expenses policy)</p> <p>RS confirmed that previously the group reimbursed expenses for those attending not on behalf of an association.</p> <p>MM considered it essential to pay for everyone’s expenses.</p> <p>Options discussed are i. for expenses to be paid through SFF Services, or ii. petty cash available from FLOs at the meetings.</p> <p>Inch Cape to pay FIRs Working Group through SFF Services. Cost sharing across developers. Administrated through SFF services. JK noted that Port Seaton FA would not want to go through SFF Services and queried whether there is a third-party option, as they would consider payment from SFF Services, to equate to being represented by SFF.</p> <p>RH explained that SFF Services would be providing an administration role. NS explained that for small values it would be extremely time consuming to pay through individual</p>		

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
	<p>developers and likely to involve a lot of paperwork. It is agreed that payment of expenses would not be possible directly through the developers.</p> <p>ACTION: developers to collectively discuss protocol for payment of expenses including who is eligible and administration of payment.</p>	RS, NB, TY	By next meeting
09	<p>Fisheries Mitigation Strategies and Cable Burial Plans</p> <p>RM can provide a generic list of consenting conditions allowing an opportunity for the group to express what they are interested in. Noted that final turbine layouts do not require full consultation with the fishing industry. Construction design methods and site layout are of interest, but do not require sign off by fishing industry consultees.</p> <p>ACTION: Prior to next meeting, RM will put forward a list of generic conditions.</p> <p>In terms of vessel management plans, cable laying, anchorage etc, the group expressed that project updates pre-financial closure will be very helpful.</p> <p>RM confirmed that MS lead the consultation in relation to consenting conditions being closed.</p> <p>JK discussed export cable burial plans and asked when stakeholders will get sight of them. Group discussed cable burial assessments which would be carried out with the industry and which would help highlight areas of concerns during burial assessment. All developers are currently undertaking site investigation work which will help inform these assessments. TY confirmed that export cable corridor being applied for by Inch Cape is wider than 200m.</p> <p>In relation to the cable route, developers confirmed that the projects will decide on exact cable position after CFD, but before finalising design. The group discussed cable risk assessment, monitoring of what has happened and meaningful consultation with industry on cable position. It is noted that costs of surveys increase as details become more specific. Noted example of 5,000 tonnes extra rock protection required for hywind after/during the laying process. MM highlighted that all problems have happened after the cable is on the seabed, so we should be learning from this. Surveys cannot predict ground conditions to a high degree of accuracy. LR agreed that ground conditions cannot be 100% confirmed until the cables are being trenched/laid.</p> <p>RH considered berms created from trenching cables are an issue and need to be smoothed out. NS provided experience that berms are not an issue in soft sediments which naturally disperse within one tidal cycle. RH highlighted the difference between berms and sediment types and highlighted experience of them being an issue for Scottish fisheries.</p> <p>RM highlighted that regulators will listen and work together with the industry and developers.</p> <p>The fishing industry representatives present expressed desire to be consulted on the cable risk assessment, and to continue to have a common-sense approach with fishing industry involvement.</p>	RM	By next meeting
10	<p>Project Updates – including current site investigation campaigns</p> <p><u>Nick Brockie, SSE – Seagreen projects</u></p> <p>After the judicial review, consent for the project was confirmed in Nov 2017. Seagreen received a scoping opinion in respect of the application for an optimised project in September 2017.</p> <p>The new application will be submitted to MS very shortly. EIA has included consultation with relevant fisheries bodies and individuals. Seagreen is preparing for the CFD round in May 2019. In parallel with new application, Seagreen have also submitted a variation to remove capacity limits from the original 2014 consent. The original application set a limit on turbine numbers and total wind farm capacity for both of the Seagreen Alpha and Bravo wind farms. Based on evolution of turbine design Seagreen is seeking to</p>		

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
	<p>utilise currently available turbines which will achieve a higher total capacity within the design envelope consented in 2014. There are no EIA implications from the requested variation.</p> <p>Seagreen have a programme of site investigation work over summer months including geophysical and geotechnical surveys. The geophys survey was completed in August 2018. The geotech survey is running from now until to Nov 2018. No further surveys are currently planning until spring/summer 2019.</p> <p>RH would be very interested to see the data and discussed potential delays due to weather. NB explained that geophysical surveys are considered to become difficult in wave heights of 1-1.5m, while geotechnical surveys have slightly more tolerance, up to 1.75m, but this is dependent on vessel characteristics and local wind, wave and tidal conditions.</p> <p>The group questioned the importance of CFD and Nick confirmed that without CFD projects cannot go ahead. The process is as follows: eligibility criteria to be submitted by Feb/Mar 2019, and in May 2019 an auction will take place. Successful CFD is then announced in July/August 2019 followed by an accelerated timeline e.g. 12 months to get to financial close. If CFD is successful, then construction of Seagreen will start 2021 /2022.</p> <p>Every two years there is a CFD round with the next one in 2021.</p> <p><u>Tom Young – Inch Cape</u></p> <p>Red Rock hold existing consent for Inch Cape as of Nov 2017. Red Rock are currently submitting an application for new consent that allows for bigger but less turbines to take advantage of new turbine technology now available, and for fewer export cables. They will also likely enter CFD round timetable of May 2019.</p> <p>TY confirmed he is leaving Red Rock, but his replacement is still to appointed.</p> <p>Site investigations include geophysical surveys and subsea profiling of development area and cable corridor: bore holes and vibro cores in development area and vibro cores across cable corridor only. Started 19 Jul, finish mid Oct weather dependent. RH is acting as FIR for Arbroath, now moving to cable corridor in next week or so, for survey.</p> <p>ST enquired about consultation to move gear. NS confirmed real time assessment of gear on the ground, with the process involving scouting for gear, contacting fishermen directly to arrange pre-survey gear clearance agreements, i.e., real time systems in place based on scouting surveys for disruption surveys. NS confirmed that lots of gear is expected when the survey reaches Port Seaton. A FLO is present as well and issued notice to fishermen, with email & dedicated number. ST confirmed these details have been received.</p> <p><u>Rosie Scurr – NnG</u></p> <p>RS confirmed that NnG project has CFD secured and expect financial close for the project early next year and offshore construction to start mid-late 2020 and onshore to commence Oct 2019.</p> <p>Site investigations currently include geotechnical surveys and UXO vessel on each of the geotech bore holes. 2 vessels at the moment, with FLO on board UXO vessels, when UXO completed, a guard vessel with FLO will join the geotech survey vessel (as it does not have space for a FLO). An additional jack up vessel will commence further geotech surveys in late September, with all surveys completed by Oct 2018.</p> <p>Agreed disruption payments during survey works and RS confirmed everything has gone smoothly so far.</p> <p>NnG are starting to prepare consent discharge plans in relation to current consent on the basis that they will also be applicable to the new application, if it is successful. The new consent application decision is expected to come through in autumn 2018.</p>		

Ref	Item / Action	Who	When
	<p><u>Marc Murray - Forthwind</u></p> <p>For the Forthwind project, MM confirmed that Cierco have taken over and will move forward with a demonstration turbine. Looking towards a larger turbine and currently in discussions with Marine Scotland regarding progressing a variation to existing consent or a new application. Longer term, it is hoped to develop 60 MW array with larger turbines, which will be smaller in terms of overall footprint. Discussing with turbine developers for testing turbine design, currently re-drawing of project. MM confirmed that Cierco are no longer moving forward with the application that is currently with Marine Scotland and are now focused on a demonstration site.</p>		
11	<p>Agenda items for next meeting:</p> <p>Discussion around consent conditions that are relevant and/or of interest to the fishing industry including Fisheries Mitigation Strategy and cable plans.</p> <p>Discussion around procedure / protocol for dropped objects.</p> <p>Next meeting – potentially February 2019. Date and location to be confirmed.</p>		