

Feedbacks received from participants during the Public Event in Peterhead 20-21/5 2014.

Following comments/questions were made and how the project is dealing with the topics is explained in the column to the right.

Comments/questions	Comments from the Project:
<p>1. The onshore work will affect the local citizen during a period of 5-8 months. Does the project have any ambition to develop a local community fund or similar (i.e. give something back to the community of Peterhead as a result of the burden the project will create for the locally during the construction phase)?</p>	<p>When base case for the onshore scope of work has been decided upon, the project will look closer into the possibility of establishing a community fund. However, we have to take into account that this project is not a large commercial project but a technology development project with limited scale of development and resources. We will discuss this further with Aberdeenshire Council.</p> <p>However, we have in connection with other offshore wind projects entered into different type of community funds.</p> <p>We find it useful to discuss further with local authorities / stakeholders to ensure that the model chosen is appropriate for the local population in Peterhead.</p>
<p>2. Have the project considered the effect this development will have on the fishing activity in Buchan Deep?</p>	<p>The project is in close dialogue with SFF, both in connection with the progress of the project and in the planning process of any offshore surveys. We have for instance used local fisherman representatives (FLO) onboard vessels during both of the surveys we have conducted (August 2013 and March 2014)</p> <p>SFF is an important stakeholder when discussing base case location of the installations. They have been consulted during this work.</p>
<p>3. The technical solution chosen may be of general danger to the vessels accessing the port of Peterhead. Has the project consider the need for a guard vessel on site?</p>	<p>Relevant stakeholders have been consulted during the work with the scoping report and comments/ requirements have been addressed in the Scoping Opinion. The Project is discussing this topic further with the local port authority, MCA, RYA, NLB and DECC.</p>

<p>4. The Hywind technology might require an exclusivity area for the mooring lines and no trawling should be allowed in the park area.</p>	<p>The need for safety zone, AtA or similar restriction needs to be looked further into together with relevant stakeholders and authorities. See comments under point 3.</p>
<p>5. Several questions on whether this pilot park was phase 1 of a larger development.</p>	<p>This Pilot Park Project in Buchan Deep is limited to 5 turbines with max capacity of 30MW and there are no plans from Statoil or The Crown Estate to expand this pilot park site to more wind turbines in the future. The Agreement for Lease with The Crown Estate is a development lease.</p> <p>However, this technology development project is a step towards commercial parks. Statoil is mapping potential location of future commercial parks worldwide.</p>
<p>6. Some technical clarification questions e.g. mooring system design in particular</p>	<p>Explained that we are still in design and development phase so not all technical aspects are clarified yet.</p>
<p>7. Expected disturbance for Peterhead residents during construction and scale of developments onshore</p>	<p>The project expect some disturbance in connection with the onshore work, which includes a substation at Balmoor Industrial Estate, cable route (approx. 2 km) and landfall at Barclay Park/Gadle Braes.</p> <p>Estimated time for the work connected to laying the cable is approx. 6-7 months and the landfall approx. 3-5 months depending on the selected solution.</p>
<p>8. Why was Buchan Deep chosen as location for the pilot park?</p>	<p>Buchan Deep has been chosen because of generally good wind conditions in the area, deep water relatively close to shore/port and the availability of grid and other facilities onshore.</p>
<p>9. Why has Peterhead been chosen as the onshore site for the project?</p>	<p>Proximity to local or national grid is important when deciding upon where to bring the export cable onshore. The project will be connected to the existing Peterhead Grange Substation. Furthermore, the infrastructure for maintenance and operations are available in Peterhead although the decision of where to locate operations and maintenance base has not yet been taken.</p>
<p>10. Have the project engaged local suppliers or do you intend to use local suppliers in the construction or/and operation phase?</p>	<p>The Aberdeen based Company Xodus is engaged as EIA coordinator and we have engaged local companies conducting some of the required EIA studies. (Optimat, Horner + Maclennan (visual impact), National Research Projects (NRP), Orkney Research Centre for Archaeology (ORCA) and Anatec , office in Aberdeen)</p>

	<p>Contractors performing technical studies may be located in Scotland. For example, Mott MacDonald are currently performing a study for the Project and they have an office in Aberdeen as well as elsewhere in the UK.</p> <p>We expect limited activity in Peterhead due to the size and the type of project. Most of the activity during operation phase will be coordinated with other Statoil-operated project in UK. However, we might end up with some local manning during operation phase. Operational philosophy is to be decided up after consent is given.</p> <p>Peterhead harbour is close to the wind farm and appears to be a natural choice for offshore vessels and supply base, but this has not been decided upon yet.</p>