

Meeting Minutes – Moray Firth Working Group Discussion 060613

Meeting Minutes/Action
Meeting Title: Meeting Minutes – Moray Firth Working Group Discussion 06062013
Date / Time / Venue: 06/06/2013 10:30 – 14:30 Glenmoriston Town House, Inverness, IV1 1QY
Attendees: Attendees: Marc Browne (MB), Peter Moore (PM), Jonathan Wilson (JWil), Sarah Pirie (SP), Rebecca Radford (RR), Malcolm Morrison (MM), John Watt Senior (JWs), John Hermse (JH), John Alexander (JA), Peter Smith (PS), Neil Sutherland (NS), Roger May (RM), Gareth Jones (GJ), David O’Sullivan (DO), John Watt Jnr (JWj)
Minutes taken by: BOWL/MORL/BMM
Apologies: Jay Mackay, Colin Warwick

Item	Action	Action on	Close out date
Meeting Objectives:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To discuss maintaining an up to date baseline; To discuss employment opportunities and potential gear modifications; To discuss potential impacts of EMFs on commercial fisheries; and To prepare questions to put forward to an engineer. 			
1.0	Welcome		
2.0	<p>RR was nominated to chair this meeting. RR discussed the minutes of the previous meeting held in Inverness (18/04/2013) and asked if anyone had any comments on these before being finalised.</p> <p>MM raised a comment regarding the MFOWDG proposal/document for commercial fisheries engagement, specifically section 3.2.3 and Development of Alternative Fisheries/Projects and asked if the word community could be replaced with the words fishing industry, as this report was specific to the fishing industry not the wider community.</p> <p>All agreed with this addition and the previous minutes were fine to sign off.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> <i>RR to update section 3.2.3 on commercial fisheries engagement document.</i></p> <p><i>RR to provide paper copies of minutes and documents to representatives who request them</i></p> <p>JWil provided a brief summary of the BOWL project and indicated that the ES Addendum had been submitted to Marine Scotland on 30th May 2013. JWil went on to say that the conclusions reached for commercial fisheries in the Original ES remained the same in the ES Addendum and that there were no significant changes that affected commercial fisheries.</p> <p>MORL’s proposals are as they were in the ES as no addendum is required.</p>	<p>RR</p> <p>RR</p>	<p>4th July 2013</p> <p>4th July 2013</p>
3.0	Commercial Fisheries Baseline Presentation		
	RR ran through a presentation on the updated commercial fisheries		

Meeting Minutes – Moray Firth Working Group Discussion 060613

	<p>baseline, as was requested at previous meeting. RR indicated that the search area remained the same as those presented in the BOWL and MORL Environmental Statements (ES). The new data presented included 2010 data. RR mentioned that there had been issues getting 2011 and 2012 data from the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) although would continue chasing the MMO for this.</p> <p>RR compared the 2009 and 2010 fishery datasets highlighting the similarities and stated that the trends appeared to be roughly the same apart from the squid fishery as there was additional data compared to previous years.</p> <p>RR went on to discuss the Fishermen's register and that the register which identified all the pertinent fishing boats in the area had been updated but required a high level review by the Fishing Industry Reps and those on the working group to identify whether there were any gaps. RR went on to say that only a brief review was required.</p> <p>RR went on to say that the register was split by area and gear type.</p> <p>JWj asked whether Marine Scotland could help in the review process of the fishermen's register as they had all the required information.</p> <p>RM indicated that they would look into this on the working group's behalf but indicated that there could be issues with data protection.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> <i>RR to distribute fishermen's register to FIRs and representatives for high level review.</i></p> <p><i>Marine Scotland to review Fishermen's Register in light of licences subject to data protection and provide update.</i></p> <p><i>Following MS review, SFF to review.</i></p> <p>GJ presented two PowerPoint presentations on over 15m VMS density analysis and the Scotmap project.</p> <p>VMS presentation: GJ described the VMS dataset, indicating that the charts illustrated a 5 year dataset, of fishing densities per specific fishery such as pelagic, herring, squid etc. GJ went on to say that the density maps were based on a 1km squared grid and as such provided a good indication of the main fishing grounds (by species).</p> <p>Scotmap Project presentation. GJ provided an overview of the work carried out by Marine Scotland Science (MSS) on the Scotmap project which aimed to identify fishing ground, by sector for the under 15m vessels which did not have VMS. Scotmap identified fishing grounds by sector and also by value.</p> <p>GJ went on to say that the information had been collected via interviews with the local fishing industry. GJ stated that the project was completed last year and that the results would be publicly available on the MS website and would be fully interactive.</p> <p>The Scotmap output for the northeast region was illustrated on a 4km grid and showed that the majority of fishing activity was coastal. Fishermen on the working group indicated that on the whole this was</p>	<p>RR</p> <p>Marine Scotland</p> <p>SFF</p>	<p>4th July 2013</p> <p>12th September 2013</p> <p>12th October 2013</p>
--	---	---	---

	<p>what they would have expected to see. It was noted by the fishermen present that the level of detail provided by different vessel operators varies which can skew the data. It should also be noted that the fishing industry is highly dynamic and changing, for example in early 2013 there have been limited nephrops.</p> <p>MB raised a query regarding the presentation to ensure that the end users of the data outputs understood the methodology of data collection, interpretation and analysis. MB went on to say that the results would need careful interpretation and that the limitations should be made clear to all, for example the shading which relates to value of catch is not directly comparable between species. Similarly, a decrease in value of catch in an area does not necessarily equate to a decrease in fishing effort.</p> <p>NS also stated that he felt the figures presented a false picture of where each species is present. GJ stated that the purpose is not to show where the species are found, rather to show where they are fished.</p> <p>It was noted that the figures showed there was not a great deal of fishing vessels below 15 m length within the BOWL or MORL wind farm areas. JH however said he was sure there were more than two (as depicted in the figures) <15 m scallop vessels fishing in the wind farm areas. JH will send GJ details of these. Under-15 m vessels have increased almost 100% (for scallops) in the past 10 years in the UK, and larger boats have decreased.</p> <p><u>Actions</u> JH send GJ a list of the scallop vessels fishing within the MORL and BOWL wind farm areas.</p>	JH	26 th July 2013
4.0	<p>Potential Opportunities for fishing industry</p> <p>RR gave a PowerPoint presentation on the potential opportunities for the fishing industry. RR went on to say that the items listed in the presentation were purely for discussion within the group and did not represent definitive opportunities that BOWL and MORL were suggesting at this point in time. Instead, MORL and BOWL are keen to hear the industry's views on these options and also on what other opportunities they may be able to provide to the renewables industry.</p> <p>MB went on to say that there should be a clear distinction between what was being discussed in the presentation and what could be offered in the long term. MB continued to say that the working group should be clear on the differences between the offshore wind industry and the oil and gas industry to specifically highlight that in general terms the offshore wind industry does not have the same resources as the oil and gas industry and that the requirements/opportunities would be different.</p> <p>RR continued to discuss the generic potential opportunities available such as vessel certification for guard vessels.</p> <p>Several queries were raised by the working group as to the process regarding guard vessel work, vessel requirements etc.</p> <p>MB explained that the likelihood of using safety/guard vessels was as yet unknown and mentioned that the requirement for safety/guard vessels was generally contracted out by the contractor carrying out a</p>		

particular operations/works rather than the project developer/owner; however where possible construction contractors would be asked to consider local fishing boats for this type of work.

MB went on to say that guard vessels are for the most part associated with the construction phase of the wind farm. It was also noted that fishing vessels could be used for other services in the development of the wind farm and the subsequent construction and post construction phases, for example:

- Fishing/fishery surveys; and
- Benthic surveys including video and sediment grab samples.

JWj mentioned that it was important that any vessel contracted to undertake guard vessel work or survey work for the offshore wind farm was fit for purpose.

All agreed.

JWs also mentioned that the developers had to manage expectations and not guarantee work or opportunities that would not come to light or that could not be made available to all.

This was noted and reiterated that the whole process would focus on managing expectations.

MB highlighted that as construction was some way off BOWL had not yet developed any strategies regarding guard vessel work and did not have any project specific policies in place to allow more detailed discussions at this stage. It was agreed that discussions surrounding potential guard vessel work would require further dialogue in the future. MB went on to say that where possible a strategy would be developed in the coming years to allow for a transparent and fair process for the identification of potential guard vessel work.

All understood the complications surrounding this issue.

SP mentioned the Renewable UK guidance document (Vessel Safety Guide) which provided developers and the renewables industry with information and insight on health and safety aspects related to the selection of vessels for offshore renewable and related works. The document assists those responsible for managing specific operations in the selection of vessels and equipment for operations; including identifying vessels that are both safe and fit for purpose. This should be back out for consultation later this year and will be an important document.

In addition other potential opportunities were discussed such as training and certification of offshore personnel. Whereby a number of trained offshore personnel might be required, for example, opportunities for skippers and crew on transfer vessels. Other opportunities potentially include the use of fishing vessels for survey work although it was noted that it was not yet known how much work this would involve at this stage.

Other potential opportunities discussed included such things as enhancing scallop stocks by seeding and lobster hatchery. These discussions were well received by the working group, but it was

Meeting Minutes – Moray Firth Working Group Discussion 060613

	<p>emphasised that the Moray Firth’s suitability for these options had not been investigated at this stage.</p> <p>The concept of community held quotas was also briefly discussed and although this may have been done in other parts of the UK it was decided that it would likely be very complicated and not something that the developers should get involved in.</p> <p>JWs highlighted that there have been problems in the past with getting MSC certification on commercial fish and shellfish species. MM said that there are ongoing costs associated with getting the certification and no guaranteed return as it only allows access to certain markets, not a price increase. JWs said it would not be possible to get MSC certification on the nephrops fishery as it is a mixed fishery, and also to achieve MSC certification can take many years. JH mentioned that it may not be worthwhile looking at getting MSC certification, instead the focus should be on advertising and educating the public.</p> <p>PS asked if vessels had to be part of the SFF to be considered for survey/guard work. It was made clear that there would be a transparent tender process in place when selecting vessels for work. GJ mentioned it would be good to allow time for vessels who are not certified and in the SFF to get the required certification when work goes to tender. PM highlighted that the previously discussed Renewable-UK guidance document (Vessel Safety Guide) should provide clear guidelines on vessel requirements in order to be eligible for survey or guard work.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> <i>RM to determine whether MS can assist in reviewing the fishermen’s register to ensure BOWL and MORL have an up to date and complete list of the boats potentially operating in the Moray Firth Area.</i></p> <p><i>Development team: to consider a strategy regarding guard vessels and to identify existing internal policies regarding the use of guard vessels.</i></p>	<p>RM</p> <p>BOWL/ MORL</p>	<p>12th September 2013</p> <p>Ongoing</p>
<p>5.0</p>	<p>EMF Presentation</p> <p>RR gave a presentation on Eletromagnetic Fields (EMFs) in order to clarify and address any further concerns regarding EMFs. RR went on to describe a considerable number of studies undertaken in the past to determine potential effects of EMFs on electrosensitive fish.</p> <p>RR went on to say that information gathered in Burbo Bank suggested that certain Elasmobranchs species (sharks, skates and rays) continued to feed inside the wind farm after construction. RR also described the sensitivity of benthic invertebrates such as crabs and bivalve molluscs and highlighted some research indicating that there was no direct evidence of effects to invertebrates from undersea cables Magnetic Fields (Normandeau et al., 2011).</p> <p>RR went on to say that no significant effects were identified in the EIAs with regards to the potential impacts associated with EMF. All assessment of effects were identified as either minor or negligible, and this assessment is supported by the existing evidence.</p> <p>Potential mitigation measures were also discussed, many of which are already embedded within the design of the cables such as sheathing/</p>		

Meeting Minutes – Moray Firth Working Group Discussion 060613

	<p>armouring and/or burial and the bundled three phase AC cables which produce lower magnetic fields. In addition the burial of cables would reduce the EMF field strength as would any rock placement or concrete matting potentially used in cable protection where the cables cannot be buried to the target depth of 1 m. RR provided a geographical representation of the cables found in UK waters highlighting the existing network of cables in UK and European waters some of which have been in operation for a considerable amount of time.</p> <p>RR concluded that numerous cables installed around the UK have not been reported to have significant impacts on commercial fishing activities specifically related to EMFs. RR went on to say that both developments had embedded mitigation options within the design of the wind farm such as cable burial and/or protection that would ensure the issues surrounding EMF would be minimised.</p> <p>MM raised the issue of starfish congregating over cables. GJ mentioned that this was not as big an issue as previously thought and a paper has been released which looked in detail at this issue. GJ said he would distribute this paper to the Working Group.</p> <p>NS raised the issue of trawling over areas where pipelines had previously been installed in the Moray Firth. Nets had been snagged and the trawl brought up clods of mud off the seabed. NS said this was due to the holes created by anchors dropped by installation vessels. It was noted that the developers will not necessarily be using anchors when laying the cables and may instead be using DP vessels although this will not be defined until later in each project development.</p> <p>JWj showed the group pictures of over-trawlability surveys undertaken by SFF to check cables/pipelines once installed, and rectification measures using a chain mat. JWj offered to provide a presentation at the next meeting to discuss this in detail.</p> <p>The SFF has been involved in remedial action for such events as illustrated by JWj's comments. It was noted that both MORL and BOWL are committed to over-trawlability surveys following cable installation, which should identify and rectify any issues.</p> <p><u>Actions:</u> <i>GJ to send RR paper on thermal heating. RR to distribute to the group</i></p> <p><i>JWj to give presentation on over-trawlability surveys at the next meeting</i></p>		
<p>6.0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>RR to contact all working group members prior to the next meeting to request for items to be discussed.</i> • <i>MORL and BOWL potentially bring engineer to next meeting to allow detailed answers and questions. RR to ensure working group members are contacted regarding any specific questions they wish to be answered.</i> • <i>SFF feedback from recent visit to Ramsgate and discussions with fishermen operating in Thanet wind farm.</i> 	<p>RR</p> <p>RR</p> <p>JWj</p>	<p>4th July 2013</p> <p>12th November 2013</p> <p>12th October 2013</p> <p>12th October 2013</p> <p>When available</p>

Date of next meeting: 12th November 2013

Minutes prepared by: Johnny Wilson, Marc Browne, Sarah Pirie, Peter Moore, Rebecca Radford

Appended Documents: Presentation Slides and Normandeau *et al.*, 2011 paper – Effects of EMFs from Undersea Power Cables on Elasmobranchs and other Marine Species.

Internal Distribution: Johnny Wilson, Marc Browne, Sarah Pirie, Peter Moore (EDPR)

External Distribution: Malcolm Morrison, John Watt Senior, John Hermse, John Alexander, Peter Smith, Neil Sutherland, Roger May, Gareth Jones, David O'Sullivan, John Watt Jnr, Colin Warwick, Jay Mackay