



# Association of Salmon Fishery Boards

## Response to the marine licence application for the Neart na Gaoithe Offshore Wind Farm project September 2012

### Introduction

The Association of Salmon Fishery Boards is the representative body for Scotland's 41 District Salmon Fishery Boards (DSFBs) including the River Tweed Commission (RTC), which have a statutory responsibility to protect and improve salmon and sea trout fisheries. The Association and Boards work to create the environment in which sustainable fisheries for salmon and sea trout can be enjoyed. Conservation of fish stocks, and the habitats on which they depend, is essential and many DSFB's operate riparian habitat enhancement schemes and have voluntarily adopted 'catch and release' practices, which in some cases are made mandatory by the introduction of Salmon Conservation Regulations. ASFB creates policies that seek where possible to protect wider biodiversity and our environment as well as enhancing the economic benefits for our rural economy that result from angling. An analysis completed in 2004 demonstrated that freshwater angling in Scotland results in the Scottish economy producing over £100 million worth of annual output, which supports around 2,800 jobs and generates nearly £50million in wages and self-employment into Scottish households, most of which are in rural areas.

We have significant concerns relating to the proposed development, particularly with regard to the uncertainty surrounding the potential negative effects on Atlantic salmon and sea trout and the integrity of a number of Special Areas of Conservation for Atlantic salmon.

As stated above, DSFBs have a statutory duty to protect and improve salmon and sea trout *fisheries*. All salmon fishing rights in Scotland (freshwater and marine) are private heritable titles. As the environmental effects of offshore technologies are uncertain, we would expect that developers should be required to remedy any negative consequences of such developments on the heritable assets and the value of those assets (including employment within the fishery) of all fishery proprietors. We therefore believe that, as a condition of consent (should such consent be granted), there should be a requirement for a formal mitigation agreement between the developer and relevant DSFBs.

### Overarching Comments

#### 1. Designated Species

As highlighted in the Environmental Statement a number of rivers in the area are designated as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC), part of the Natura 2000 network – a series of internationally important wildlife sites throughout the European Union. The conservation objectives for these sites are set out below<sup>1</sup>.

*To avoid deterioration of the habitats of the qualifying species or significant disturbance to the qualifying species, thus ensuring that the integrity of the site is maintained and the site makes an appropriate contribution to achieving favourable conservation status for each of the qualifying features; and*

*To ensure for the qualifying species that the following are maintained in the long term:*

- *Population of the species, including range of genetic types for salmon, as a viable component of the site*
- *Distribution of the species within site*
- *Distribution and extent of habitats supporting the species*
- *Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats supporting the species*
- *No significant disturbance of the species*

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://gateway.snh.gov.uk/sitelink/index.jsp>

- *Distribution and viability of freshwater pearl mussel host species*
- *Structure, function and supporting processes of habitats*

The Habitats Directive (article 6) requires that *Member States shall take appropriate steps to avoid, in the special areas of conservation, the deterioration of natural habitats and the habitats of species as well as disturbance of the species for which the areas have been designated, in so far as such disturbance could be significant in relation to the objectives of this Directive.*

It also states: *In the light of the conclusions of the [appropriate] assessment of the implications for the site and subject to the provisions of paragraph 4, the competent national authorities shall agree to the plan or project only after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the site concerned and, if appropriate, after having obtained the opinion of the general public.*

If this is not the case and there are no alternative solutions, the proposal can only be allowed to proceed if there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest.

The conservation status of the Atlantic salmon qualifying interest for the various SACs (First Assessment Cycle) are set out in Table 1 below. In addition, a number of these SACs are also designated for FW pearl mussel.

SAC	Qualifying Interest	Conservation Status
River Dee	Atlantic salmon	favourable maintained
River South Esk	Atlantic salmon	unfavourable recovering
River Tay	Atlantic salmon	favourable maintained
River Teith	Atlantic salmon	unfavourable recovering
River Tweed	Atlantic salmon	unfavourable recovering

**Table 1:** Conservation status of SACs for Atlantic salmon in the area of the development.

In all cases, the Salmon rod catch trends in these SACs as analysed by Marine Scotland Science, show that the spring stock component is in decline. The second assessment cycle is nearing completion, and the results of this assessment must be taken into account in the licensing decision. We believe that the assessment is likely to show that the early running spring component of many of these Atlantic salmon populations continues to deteriorate.

In addition, District Salmon Fishery Boards have a statutory obligation to protect sea trout. The marine phases of both Atlantic salmon and sea trout have also been included on the draft list of Priority Marine Features drawn together by SNH - the habitats and species of *greatest conservation importance* in inshore waters.

## **2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation**

As for many other species, climate change has been identified as a threat to Atlantic salmon. The species' developmental rate is directly related to water temperature, and increasing temperature in freshwater may result in smolts developing more rapidly and entering the ocean at a suboptimal time in relation to their planktonic food sources.

In addition, as air temperatures warm, much of the snow that feeds the river systems is expected to melt earlier. This will lead to a reduction in the flow of many rivers in the spring and summer, which will increase water temperatures further and may reduce the overall optimal habitat available to the Atlantic salmon. It is also clear that survival of salmon and sea trout during their marine migration phase has fallen over the last 40 years. Some of this reduced survival can be explained by changes in sea surface temperature and subsequent contraction of feeding grounds.

The first priority in mitigating these effects is to control atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases and we note that the Scottish Government has committed to meeting a stated target of 50% of Scotland's electricity demand from renewable sources by 2020. However, with further climate change inevitable in the short to medium term, attention is now focusing on the development of accommodation and adaptation strategies, through which adverse effects on species or ecosystems can be minimized. Some of the key needs with respect to

developing adaptation strategies for rivers and their biodiversity were summarised by Ormerod (2009 – *Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.* 19: 609–613). We would highlight the following key point in particular: *to minimize the adverse effects on river biodiversity of actions taken to mitigate climate change.*

### **3. Potential Negative Effects of Offshore Renewable Devices**

Offshore renewable developments have the potential to directly and indirectly impact anadromous fish such as Atlantic salmon and sea trout. We would therefore expect developers to assess the potential impacts of deployed devices on such fish during the deployment, operation and decommissioning phases. Such potential impacts have been highlighted by Marine Scotland Science and could include:

- Avoidance (including exclusion from particular rivers and subsequent impacts on local populations);
- Disorientation effects that could potentially affect behaviour, susceptibility to predation or by-catch; and
- Impaired ability to locate normal feeding grounds or river of origin; and delayed migration

ASFB therefore recommend to our members that careful consideration should be given to the following activities:

*i. Subsea noise during construction*

A recent review commissioned by SNH<sup>2</sup> states that ‘Marine renewable energy devices that require pile driving during construction appear to be the most relevant to consider, in addition to the time scale over which pile driving is carried out, for the species under investigation’.

*ii. Subsea noise during operation*

*iii. Electromagnetic fields (EMFs) arising from cabling*

The SNH-commissioned review (cited above) has shown that EMFs from subsea cables have the potential to interact with European eels and possibly salmonids if their migration or movement routes take them over the cables, particularly in shallow waters (<20m). Marine Scotland Science are currently undertaking a research programme which aims to investigate electro-magnetic force impacts on salmonids. We would hope to have some results from this work later in 2012. It is vital that all cables are appropriately shielded to ensure that EMF effects are below any threshold of effect for salmonids.

*iv. EMFs arising from operation of devices*

It is important to ensure that such effects are quantified and assessed in the Environmental Statement.

*v. Disturbance or degradation of the benthic environment (including secondary effects on prey species)*

It is important to ensure that such effects are quantified and assessed in the Environmental Statement.

*vi. Aggregation effects*

Whilst the aggregation of prey items around physical structures might be seen as a positive effect, possible negative effects might include the associated aggregation of predators.

### **4. General Comments on the Application**

Guidance issued by Marine Scotland Science relating to information requirements on diadromous fish of freshwater fisheries interest states that an Environmental Statement should provide information on the use of the development area by such fish and that if such information was lacking then a suitable monitoring strategy should be devised. Indeed, Marine Scotland Science regard the monitoring undertaken at existing offshore developments such as Robin Rigg as being inadequate. No monitoring strategy specific to migratory salmonids is set out in the application and we believe that the lack of meaningful monitoring in the present proposal is extremely disappointing and completely inadequate. We would emphasise that any monitoring strategies must

---

<sup>2</sup> Literature review on the potential effects of electromagnetic fields and subsea noise from marine renewable energy developments on Atlantic salmon, sea trout and European eel. Available at: <http://www.asfb.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/SNH-EMF-Report1.pdf>

include pre-construction monitoring in order that baseline information on salmon and sea trout movement, abundance, swimming depth, feeding behaviour etc. can be collected.

As with other applications for offshore renewable energy, the Rochdale Envelope approach is set out in the application. It must be emphasised that this approach makes it extremely difficult for stakeholders to assess the potential environmental risk as there is little detailed information on: the likely size of the scheme; the type of devices to be deployed; and the degree of confidence attached to the assessment of impacts. Our comments must therefore be viewed on that basis.

### Specific comments

Our specific comments relate to the potential effects highlighted in Section 3 above.

### Habitats Risk Assessment

We note from Box 1.7 and Table 11.3 in Chapter 11 that neither the River Dee nor the River Tweed appear to have been considered as part of the HRA. We do not believe that this is acceptable, nor indeed is it compatible with the information on salmonid migration routes provided by Marine Scotland Science<sup>3</sup>. Representatives from both of these rivers attended pre-application events organised by the developers.

#### 15.6.3.7 Diadromous Fish

Table 15.10 states purports to set out to time of migration **to** and **from** natal rivers. However, only the migration of Atlantic salmon and sea trout smolts **from** natal rivers is actually set out. It is important to note that Atlantic salmon return to Scottish rivers in all 12 months of the year. Equally sea trout would be expected to return to natal rivers during the autumn.

#### 15.7.1 Impact Assessment – Construction Phase

##### Noise

As detailed in the Environmental Statement, the assessment of noise impacts carries high uncertainty. The ES also recognises that the significance of behavioural avoidance is dependent on the behaviour disrupted. For example, avoidance may be significant if it causes a migratory species to be held up or prevented from reaching areas of biological importance, e.g., spawning and feeding areas. The potential zone of effect, at the lower threshold level of 75 dB<sub>ht</sub> (representing significant avoidance) the predicted area which salmon would avoid is significant. The ES states that 85% of fish were found to react to this level of noise, and we believe it is possible that noise at this threshold level has the potential to at least delay smolt migration. As no information is available on smolt migration routes, we must assume that such a delay could, for example, make smolts more susceptible to predation. It must also be noted that salmonid smolts are physiologically stressed in adapting to the environmental challenge of movement between freshwater and seawater. Simultaneous challenge from noise, EMFs etc. during this transition will constitute a significant additional stressor. Stress leads to increased plasma levels of the stress hormone cortisol. Corticosteroids cause a range of secondary effects, including hydromineral imbalance and changes in intermediary metabolism (Wendelaar Bonga, 1997)<sup>4</sup>. In addition, tertiary responses extend to a reduction in the immune response and reduced capacity to tolerate subsequent or additional stressors (Wendelaar Bonga, 1997).

The ES operates under the assumption that Atlantic salmon and sea trout are present in the development area. However, the zones of avoidance set out do not appear to be related to the swimming speeds of fish (at different life stages), in order to assess the possibility of such fish swimming out of the zone of effect. We welcome the fact that piling operations will be intermittent, with each pile driving event predicted to occur for no longer than three hours and 20 minutes with noise breaks for up to 26.5 hours estimated between piling events. We also welcome reference to soft start piling which we believe will be necessary to ensure that Atlantic salmon and sea trout, of all life stages, can safely avoid traumatic hearing damage. However, no detail is given as to the duration of such soft

---

<sup>3</sup> Malcolm, I.A., Godfrey, J. & Youngson, A.F. Review of migratory routes and behaviour of Atlantic salmon, sea trout and European eel in Scotland's coastal environment: implications for the development of marine renewables. Scottish Marine and Freshwater Science Volume 1 No 14.

<sup>4</sup> Wendelaar Bonga, S. E. (1997). The stress response in fish. *Physiol. Rev.* 77, 591-625.

start piling, and such duration must be appropriate to the swimming speeds of the species in question, to allow that species time to move out of the zone of effect. Should the development be granted consent, we believe that an appropriate duration of soft start piling, related to the swimming speed of juvenile salmon and sea trout, should be a condition of consent.

However, given the paucity of information on noise effects, we do not believe that soft piling alone is an appropriate mitigation. The ES sets out a number of options for turbine design (including gravity bases) of which the worst case scenario for noise is impact piling of pin piles. We believe that, given the sensitivity of early running returning spring salmon, and the uncertainty of effects on juvenile fish, that it is appropriate, should consent be granted for the development, that a condition of consent is that no impact piling occurs during the period from March to June (inclusive). Such a condition is consistent with the precautionary principle and would still allow other forms of construction to continue during this period.

During pre-application discussions with the developers we have continually stressed the need for information on migratory routes and habitat usage for migratory salmonids. In the absence of such data (and the ES simply assumes that they are present), ASFB and DSFBs, in assessing the risks of the development to migratory fish, have no alternative but to assume that the entire run of each river will use the area under development. We note that Marine Scotland Science have previously commented that *'it needs to be categorically established which species are present on the site, and where, before the application is considered for consent'*.

Given the above concerns and the high uncertainty surrounding the assessment of noise impacts we do not agree with the assessment in paragraph 174, 175 and Table 15.15 that 'the magnitude of the effect on salmon and trout is considered to be negligible' and 'the vulnerability of salmon and trout is considered to be low and the overall impact on salmon and trout populations predicted to be of *minor significance*'.

#### **15.7.2 Impact Assessment – Operation and Maintenance**

##### *Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) generated by subsea cables*

We are aware that Marine Scotland Science are currently undertaking a research programme which aims to investigate electro-magnetic force impacts on salmonids. Until this work is completed, we are unable to assess the relative magnitude of this impact or the likely behavioural response in salmonids. We therefore do not agree with the assessment that the overall effect of EMF is assessed to be of minor significance based on the relatively small footprint of the cables within the Neart na Gaoithe offshore works area.

We are particularly concerned about the possible effects of EMFs arising from the export cable to shore, given that it crosses a known salmonid migration route, which is likely to be of major significance to all East Coast rivers. Paragraph 235 states that DECC recommends cables to be buried to a depth of at least 1.5 m so as to keep cable below the most active biological layer. However, Chapter 5 (Table 5.16) states that the burial depth is likely to vary across site **up to** 1.5 m. We believe that all cables should be buried to a minimum depth of 1.5m and where this is not possible, all cables should be covered by placing a suitable shielding material above the cable to an equivalent depth.

##### *Introduction of New Substrates*

We are concerned that the potential for the structures to act as fish aggregation devices (FADs) could potentially be negative in the case of wild salmonids. However, if the structures do act as FADs we would be concerned that such areas may in fact represent new 'pinch points' for predation of migrating smolts and returning adults. This possibility does not appear to be considered in the application.

#### **Monitoring and mitigation measures**

As stated above, we are disappointed at the lack of salmonid-specific monitoring. We are keen to work with the developers and Marine Scotland to identify appropriate monitoring programmes. We would emphasise that any monitoring strategies must include pre-construction monitoring in order that baseline information on salmon and sea trout movement, abundance, swimming depth, feeding behaviour etc. can be collected.

We are very disappointed to see that no mitigation measures are proposed other than inter-array cable burial/protection, to reduce the effects associated with the construction/decommissioning and operation phase of the development. We believe that **all** inter-array cabling should be buried to a minimum depth of 1.5m or have

a suitable shielding material placed over them. We do not believe that there should be any exceptions to this, irrespective of the technical difficulties involved. In addition, we would highlight our comments regarding mitigation with regard to impact driving during the spring. We note that reference is made to mitigation measures to minimise and mitigate noise produced during potential piling operations (such as large or small bubble curtains or sound-absorbing sleeves) in Chapter 25, but no attempt is made to quantify the effect of such mitigation measures.

### **Conclusion**

As stated above, ASFB recognises the importance of offshore renewable energy. However, the environmental statement has failed to demonstrate that the development will not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC rivers on the East coast of Scotland. Where a Natura site is involved, the onus is on the developer to demonstrate no impact and in the absence of that the precautionary principle will apply. Under these circumstances, we do not consider that the proposed development is compatible with the requirements of the Habitats Directive or Scotland's Marine Nature Conservation Strategy. On that basis, we have no alternative but to formally object to the proposed development, until adequate monitoring and mitigation strategies have been put in place.

It should be emphasised that we have no wish to prevent or delay the proposed development unnecessarily and we remain keen to work constructively with the developers and Marine Scotland to identify appropriate monitoring programmes which will allow us to be able to assess the acknowledged risks of this development, and other proposed developments more appropriately. We stated in our introduction that we believe that a formal mitigation agreement should be a condition of consent. In addition, there is a clear and urgent need to fund, plan and start strategic research on the movement, abundance, swimming depth, feeding behaviour etc. of salmon and sea trout. Such research would clearly feed into the potential mitigation measures that might be deemed appropriate, and the conditions under which such mitigation should be enacted. One aspect that should be considered immediately is the installation of fish counters, particularly in SAC rivers, to allow the real time understanding of adult salmon abundance (and depending on local conditions, new technology might even allow information on smolt escapement to be collected). We believe that the installation of such counters, in close liaison with the DSFBs in question and MSS, could potentially be considered as a condition of consent, where appropriate to local conditions, should such consent ultimately be granted. Developers should be encouraged to work together to fund such strategic monitoring, including the on-going costs of operating such counters, in order to allow more certainty for all involved.

The scale of proposed offshore wind developments and other technical approaches to marine renewables development represents a step-change in the exposure of marine animals of high cultural and economic significance to attendant risks. In many cases, understanding of the risks is insufficient to support proposals for mitigation even at this late stage when substantial developments are being submitted for licensing. The cumulative impact of the Neart na Gaoithe proposal alongside those developments that are likely to follow in the near future is potentially even greater. We would therefore recommend that an expert group is set up to rapidly consider the best way forward to plug the considerable knowledge gaps that remain. It is important that the best scientific and biological talent is made available to find practicable ways to address the unresolved issues. ASFB would be very keen to constructively engage with such a group.

### **For further information please contact:**

Alan Wells | Policy & Planning Director  
Tel: 0131 272 2797 | Email: alan@asfb.org.uk