



AI Appendix 8D

Scoping of the Assessment October 2017 – September 2019: Summary





Appendix 8D

Scoping of the Assessment October 2017 – September 2019: Summary

This appendix provides the rationale for the scope of the assessment and comprises two tables. Table **8D.1** describes and justifies the level of importance assigned to the ecological features identified during the data gathering exercise carried out to inform this assessment and includes those features recorded from October 2017 to September 2019. Table **8D.2** determines and justifies whether those ecological features require further assessment as they have either sufficient legal protection for a breach in legislation to occur or are of sufficient importance that a significant effect may occur as a result of the Proposed Development.

Within **Table 8D.1**, consideration is given to both the importance of ecological features based on legislation and policy (refer to paragraphs **EIA** Chapter 8 Section **8.7.1 to 8.7.3** (Wood. 2019)) and importance with regard to the Proposed Development Survey Area (refer to paragraphs **EIA** Chapter 8 Section **8.7.1 to 8.7.3** and **Table 8.8** (Wood. 2019)). The justification provided for the decision to scope in or out each ecological feature is based on information on its status both with regard to the Proposed Development Survey Area (**Table 8D.1**) and the Development Site and associated Zol in **Table 8D.2**, and the local, county, regional, national or international context, where available.

Table 8D.1 Importance of Ecological Features

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding black-throated diver	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 12 pairs, c. 7% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 and 2019, it is assumed that up to three pairs of black-throated diver breed within the survey area, and that it is possible that some of this activity may be associated with SPA qualifying birds. VP surveys recorded 13 (2018) and 19 flights (2019) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Assuming all three pairs are associated with the SPA, this equates to 25% of the SPA population and thus the survey area is considered to be of international importance for the SPA population.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding dunlin	International	Negligible	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (in December 2000) was for 3,400 pairs, c. 25% of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided seven territories fell within the MBS survey area in 2018 with five of these falling within the Development Site (EIA Appendix 8C). An estimated three territories fell within the MBS survey area in the 2019 breeding season with two of these falling within the Development Site (AI Appendix 8B). Territories were distributed around the edges and the central part of the Development Site boundary, with a concentration to the south-west, where some territories partly fell within the Lewis Peatlands SPA.</p> <p>Flight activity recorded from VP surveys was low, with just three (2018) and five flights (2019) flights being observed within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (0.08% of the SPA population assuming all territories are associated with the SPA population), the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding golden eagle	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (December 2000) is for 5 pairs, c. 1% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al, 2015; Challis et al 2016).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey area (AI Appendix 8C). Territories for two of these pairs fall within the SPA, representing 40% of the SPA population. Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 26 (2018) and 39 flights (2019) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>The survey area is considered to be of international importance for the SPA population.</p>	N
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding golden plover	International	Negligible	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation (December 2000) is for 1,800 pairs during the breeding season, approximately 4.8% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided 10 territories fell within the MBS survey area in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C), and nine in 2019 (AI Appendix 8B).</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Territories were distributed around the edges of the Proposed Development Site boundary, with a concentration on the western, southern and northern edges of the Site, overlapping with the Lewis Peatlands SPA site boundary.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 10 (2018) and 26 flights (2019) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (assuming all territories are associated with the SPA population, nine territories equates to 0.5% of the SPA population), the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population during the breeding season.</p>	
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding greenshank	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 140 pairs, c 11% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), it is assumed that up to six pairs of greenshank utilise the area within and around the survey area, and that this activity may be associated with SPA qualifying birds.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded five flights in 2018 and 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 4.3% of the Lewis Peatlands SPA population, and the survey area is considered to be of international importance during the breeding season for the SPA population.</p>	N
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding merlin	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 20 pairs, c 4.62% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), one pair of merlin associated with the SPA utilise the area within and around the survey area.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 12 flights in 2018 and eight in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 5% of the Lewis Peatlands SPA population and the survey area is considered to be of international importance during the breeding season for the SPA population.	
Lewis Peatlands SPA: breeding red-throated diver	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands SPA citation is for 80 pairs, c 6.3% of the Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), up to five pairs of red-throated diver breed within the survey area, three of which fall within the SPA. It is possible that the two remaining pairs may also be associated with SPA qualifying birds.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 112 flights in 2018 and 94 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E). FW surveys recorded 165 flights in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 192 in 2019 (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 6.25% of the Lewis Peatlands SPA population and is considered to be of international importance during the breeding season for the SPA population.</p>	N
Lewis Peatlands Ramsar: black-throated diver greenshank red-throated diver	International	International	<p>The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar supports nationally important populations of breeding black-throated diver, greenshank and red-throated diver.</p> <p>The Ramsar site shares the same boundary as the Lewis Peatlands SPA and thus the survey area is considered to be of International importance for the SPA populations of these species.</p>	N
Lewis Peatlands Ramsar: dunlin golden plover	International	Negligible	<p>The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar citation for breeding dunlin is for 4,386 pairs, c. 33% of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wilson et al 2015).</p> <p>The Lewis Peatlands Ramsar supports a nationally important population of golden plover. Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved for both species, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the Ramsar populations during the breeding season.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Ness and Barvas SPA: corncrake	International	Negligible	The Ness and Barvas SPA citation is for 18 breeding individuals, c 1.4 % of the estimated Scottish breeding population (Wotton et al 2015). Corncrake were not recorded during any surveys, and therefore the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for the SPA population.	Y
Achmore Bog SSSI:	National	National	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8km from the closest proposed infrastructure. It is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.	N
Tong Saltings SSSI:	National	Negligible	Tong Saltings SSSI is located c 3km from the closest proposed infrastructure. There is a lack of habitat connectivity/continuity with the peatland habitats of the Proposed Development Site and the saltmarsh/coastal habitat of the SSSI. The Proposed Development Site is considered to be of negligible importance for the SSSI breeding and wintering bird populations.	Y
Arctic skua: breeding	National	Negligible	Breeding arctic skua is included on the Scottish Biodiversity List (SBL) and is a Red Listed Bird of Conservation Concern (BoCC) (Eaton et al. 2015) due to a severe decline in its breeding population within the UK. Within the UK it is confined to breeding in north and west Scotland, at the southern extremity of its circumpolar, high latitude breeding range. Scotland supports an estimated 1,027 breeding pairs of Arctic skua, with Shetland and Orkney supporting the majority of the population (915 pairs combined) whilst Natural Heritage Zone 3 (NHZ3), comprising the Western Isles, Coll and Tiree supports 73 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015). Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), there were no breeding attempts within the survey area. VP surveys recorded 1 flight in 2018 and none in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E). Given the lack of breeding evidence and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Barnacle goose: non-breeding	International	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding barnacle goose is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50 % of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>An estimated 94,000 are thought to over-winter in the UK (Musgrove et al, 2013), whilst the Scottish population is estimated at approximately 70,000 (Forester et al. 2007). NHZ3 is thought to support 12,604 individuals (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded no flights in 2018 and one flight of 13 birds in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided (with approximately 0.1% of the NHZ wintering population) the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Bar-tailed godwit	National	Negligible	<p>Black-tailed godwit is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), SBL and is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in its breeding population and being a rare breeding bird.</p> <p>The Icelandic subspecies of the black-tailed godwit (<i>Limosa limosa islandica</i>) breeds in Iceland, the Faeroes, and in the UK on Orkney and Shetland and is estimated to have a stable size of 5,000–15,000 pairs (Hagemeijer & Blair. 1997). The UK population was estimated at between 7 to 9 pairs over the period 2006-2010 (Musgrove et al, 2013).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded a single flight of five birds in May 2018 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Black-throated diver: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Black-throated diver is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is an Amber listed BoCC due to it being a rare breeding bird.</p> <p>The black-throated diver population in Scotland is estimated at 176 (range 123 to 245) breeding pairs (Wilson et al. 2015). The breeding population increased 16% between 1994 and 2006 (Eaton et al. 2007). NHZ3 supports approximately 35 pairs (range 19-55) (Wilson et al. 2015).</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), up to three pairs breed within the survey area. VP surveys recorded 13 flights in 2018 and 19 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>The survey area supports c. 8.6% of the regional NHZ population and is thus considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	
Common sandpiper: breeding	Local	Negligible	<p>Common sandpiper is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate breeding population decline over the last 25 years. A summer migrant, an estimated 15,000 pairs breed in the UK (Musgrove et al. 2013) and are found breeding primarily on upland watercourses and waterbodies.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports between five to 11 territories.</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Common tern: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Common tern is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to at least 50% of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites. An estimated 502 pairs were considered to be breeding on the Western Isles in 2000 (Mitchell et al, 2004), representing approximately 10% of the Scottish population (4,784 pairs).</p> <p>A breeding colony of approximately 50 pairs was recorded on an island within Loch a Chlachain, within the Development Site in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>VP surveys revealed that flight activity was focussed along a regular flight corridor that followed the River Creed from the breeding colony at Loch a Chlachain down to coastal foraging areas with a total of 60 flights being recorded within the CRZ in 2018 and 75 in 2019 (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season, holding approximately 10% of the regional population.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Dipper: breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Dipper is listed as an Amber BoCC due to a moderate population decline over the last 25 years. The UK population is estimated at between 6,200-18,700 pairs (Musgrove et al. 2013).</p> <p>A single territory was recorded during breeding surveys in 2019 (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (0.02% of the UK population) the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Dunlin: breeding	International	Local	<p>Dunlin is listed on the Annex 1, SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate breeding population decline over the last 25 years, and with at least 50% of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>A summer migrant, an estimated 13,313 pairs breed in Scotland with 5,996 located in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports between three to seven territories. Territories were distributed around the edges and the central part of the Development Site boundary, with a concentration to the south-west.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded three flights in 2018 and five in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (up to 0.11% of the NHZ regional population) the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Golden eagle: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Golden eagle is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1, 1A and A1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and the SBL. This species is a Green listed BoCC.</p> <p>Within Scotland, there are an estimated 508 occupied home ranges, based on a national survey carried out in 2015 (Challis et al, 2016). NHZ3 was considered to contain 81 breeding pairs based on the 2003 national survey data (Wilson et al. 2015), although the 2015 data indicates that numbers on the Western Isles increased to 95 occupied home ranges (Hayhow et al, 2017).</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Golden eagle occupy their territories throughout the year but non-breeding sub adult birds can range over large distances.</p> <p>Based on the data provided, it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey area (AI Appendix 8C). Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 26 (2018) and 39 flights (2019) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season, holding approximately 3.2% of the Western Isles population.</p>	
Golden eagle: non-breeding	International	Regional	<p>Based on the data provided from non-breeding flight activity surveys and existing knowledge of territorial pairs surveys, it is assumed that up to three pairs of adult golden eagle utilise the area within and around the survey. Additionally, the area is utilised by non-territorial immature birds.</p> <p>The survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the non-breeding season.</p>	N
Golden plover: breeding	International	Local	<p>Golden plover is included on the Annex 1, SBL and is a Green listed BoCC.</p> <p>The breeding population of golden plovers within Scotland is estimated at 37,480, with 4,194 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided ten territories fell within the MBS survey area in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C), and nine in 2019 (AI Appendix 8B). Territories were distributed around the edges of the Proposed Development Site boundary, with a concentration on the western, southern and northern edges of the Site, overlapping with the Lewis Peatlands SPA site boundary.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded ten (2018) and twenty-six flights (2019) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development would result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved (nine territories equate to 0.23% of the NHZ regional population), the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Golden plover: Non-breeding	International	Local	<p>There are an estimated 25,000 – 35,000 individuals wintering in Scotland (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded five (2017-18) and six flights (2018-19) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided (with approximately 0.14 % of the Scottish wintering population) the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species.</p>	Y
Goosander: non-breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>It is listed as a Green BoCC. The national wintering population is estimated at 5, 296 individuals (Humphreys et al. 2016).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded three flights (2018-19) within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the very low levels of flight activity, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Great black-backed gull: breeding	Regional	Regional	<p>Great black-backed gull is an Amber BoCC due to a moderate breeding population decline over 25 years.</p> <p>The Scottish breeding population of great black-backed gull was estimated to be 6,820 breeding pairs, with 1,712 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to 78 territories. In addition, counts of up to 60 were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, whilst the species contributed to a maximum mixed herring / great black-backed gull count of c. 500 individuals recorded loafing / roosting there. Furthermore, counts of up to 300 were observed roosting on rooftops at the Creed Industrial Park located outside of the south eastern site boundary.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys, the survey area supports approximately 4.6% of the NHZ regional breeding population, and the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Great skua: breeding	Regional	Regional	<p>Great skua is an Amber listed BoCC due to the international importance of the UK breeding population and at least 50 % of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites. The Scottish population of great skua was estimated to be 12,832 breeding pairs, with 283 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to 13 territories. Breeding activity was focussed in one main area in the centre of the Development Site, and outliers to the north and south of the Site.</p> <p>Flight activity was particularly intense in the central area associated with the main breeding area, with a total of 266 and 263 flights recorded in 2018 and 2019 respectively (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supported approximately 4.6% of the NHZ regional breeding population. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	N
Greenland white-fronted goose: non-breeding	International	Negligible	<p>Greenland white-fronted goose is listed on Annex 1, the Scottish Biodiversity List and is Red listed BoCC. The Scottish population was estimated to be 16,000 individuals, with 2,516 within NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded a single flight in October 2018, falling outside of the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on these levels of activity, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the non-breeding season.</p>	Y
Greenshank: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Greenshank is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50% of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>The Scottish population of greenshank was estimated to be 1,297 breeding pairs, with 256 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), the survey area supports up to 6 territories.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>VP surveys recorded five flights in both 2018 and 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 2.3% of the NHZ regional breeding population, and the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	
Greylag goose: breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Greylag goose is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK.</p> <p>The Scottish population of breeding greylag goose was estimated to be 47,405 breeding pairs (Mitchell et al. 2011) with 1,912 on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00063657.2011.585629).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to 10 territories.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 48 flights in 2018 and 23 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys and flight activity surveys, the survey area supports approximately 0.52% of the Lewis and Harris breeding population, with flight activity focussed within the Development Site, and the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Greylag goose: non-breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding greylag goose is an Amber listed BoCC with at least 50% of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>The Scottish population of non-breeding greylag goose was estimated to be 100,000 individuals (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 19 flights in 2017-18 and 14 in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on these levels of activity, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the non-breeding season.</p>	Y
Hen harrier: breeding	International	National	<p>Breeding hen harrier is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1 and 1A of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) the SBL and is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in the breeding population.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>The Scottish population of hen harrier was estimated to be 501 breeding pairs, with 48 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015), based on data collected during a national survey in 2010. A more recent national survey was carried out in 2016, and this put the Scottish population at an estimated 460 pairs of hen harrier (Challis et al. 2018). The 2016 data indicated that there were 43 territories in the Western Isles, four of which were on the Isle of Lewis (figures were not provided at the NHZ level). Hen harrier have never nested on the Isle of Lewis before 2015, although there is a thriving population on the Uists, further south on the Outer Hebrides.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from recent historical records (EIA Appendix A), breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), there has been a gradual increase in the recently established population with up to 8 territories within the survey area and an additional two territories outside the survey area. In 2018, five monitored territories fledged at least 9 young, whilst in 2019, out of seven monitored territories only one nest was successful, fledging four chicks. VP surveys recorded 92 flights in 2018 and 52 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E). FW surveys recorded 189 flights in 2018 and 81 in 2019.</p> <p>The population within the survey area represents approximately 23.2% of the Western Isles population and 80% of the Isle of Lewis population and the survey area is considered to be of national importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	
Hen harrier: non-breeding	International	Regional	<p>Non-breeding hen harrier is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1A of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. There is little information on of the over-wintering population of hen harriers in the UK, although Forrester estimated that Scotland held between 1,050-1540 individuals (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from surveys in 2017-18 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2018-19 (AI Appendix 8C), the survey area is utilised by at least six individuals over the winter period, with two active roosting areas, one of which is within the Development Site. VP surveys recorded 28 flights in 2017-18 and 55 in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E). Roost monitoring flights recorded 14 flights in 2018 and 82 in 2019.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Herring gull: breeding	National	Regional	<p>Based on the data provided the survey area supports approximately 0.65% of the Scottish non-breeding population. Although there are no estimates for wintering hen harrier at the NHZ level, the survey area is still considered to be of regional importance at the NHZ level.</p> <p>Breeding herring gull is listed on the SBL and is a Red listed BoCC due to a severe breeding population decline over 25 years. The Scottish population of herring gull was estimated to be 52,089 breeding pairs, with 1,251 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to 615 territories. In addition, numbers were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, whilst the species contributed to a maximum mixed herring / great black-backed gull count of c. 500 individuals recorded utilising the area and c. 750 individuals were recorded roosting on roof tops at the Creed Industrial Park just outside of the south-eastern Site boundary.</p> <p>Based on the data provided the survey area supports approximately 49% of the NHZ regional breeding population and the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	N
Lesser black-backed gull: breeding	Regional	Regional	<p>Breeding lesser black-backed gull is an Amber listed BoCC due to the international importance of the UK breeding population and at least 50% of the UK breeding population being located within 10 or less sites. The Scottish population of lesser black-backed gull was estimated to be 24,457 breeding pairs, with 547 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to 63 territories. In addition, birds were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, and 30 individuals were observed loafing on Loch Airigh na Lic on the eastern boundary of the Site.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			Based on the data provided from breeding surveys the survey area supports approximately 5.5% of the NHZ regional breeding population (including birds recorded loafing) and the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.	
Mallard: breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Mallard is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK.</p> <p>The mallard is widespread and ubiquitous throughout the UK, and the Scottish population was estimated at 17,000 – 43,000 pairs (Forrester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to four territories.</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Merlin: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Merlin is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is a Red listed BoCC due to a historical decline in the breeding population.</p> <p>The Scottish population of merlin was estimated to be between 403-455 breeding pairs, with 53 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). Three occupied home ranges were found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis (Challis et al. 2018a).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), the survey area supports one territory.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 12 flights in 2018 and eight in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided the survey area supports approximately 1.8% of the NHZ regional breeding and the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	N
Merlin: non-breeding	International	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding merlin is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive and the SBL.</p> <p>An estimated 3,000 + individuals are present as non-breeding birds in Scotland (Forester et al. 20007).</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>VP surveys recorded 2 flights in 2017-18 and 14 in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	
Pink-footed goose: non-breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding pink-footed goose is an Amber listed BoCC. The Scottish population of non-breeding pink-footed goose is of international importance, with an estimated 360,000 individuals (Musgrove et al. 2013). NHZ 3 was estimated to hold approximately 65 individuals (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 0 flights in 2017-18 and 11 in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the timing of the flights, it is likely that flight activity was related to birds undergoing autumn migration from breeding grounds to wintering grounds further south. This activity represents 0.37% of the national over-wintering population. Based on the data provided the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Peregrine: breeding	International	Negligible	<p>Breeding peregrine is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the SBL and is listed as a Green BoCC. The Scottish population of peregrine was estimated to be between 485 breeding pairs, with 16 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). Five occupied home range were found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (Challis et al. 2018a).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 no evidence of breeding was recorded.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded one flight in 2018 and one in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the lack of breeding and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Peregrine: non-breeding	International	Negligible	<p>Non-breeding peregrine is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive, is listed on the SBL and is listed as a Green BoCC.</p> <p>The Scottish population of peregrine was estimated to be between 485 breeding pairs, with 16 in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015). Five occupied home range were found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (Challis et al. 2018a). Wintering numbers across Scotland are likely to be similar to breeding levels.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded one flight in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Red-breasted merganser: breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>It is listed as a Green BoCC. The national population is estimated at 1, 432 pairs (Humphreys et al. 2016).</p> <p>A single flight was recorded in April 2019, with no activity recorded at PCH (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the very low levels of flight activity and lack of breeding records, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Red grouse: breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Red grouse is listed as an Amber BoCC due to its status of being threatened in Europe. The UK population is estimated at 230,000 pairs (Musgrove et al. 2013).</p> <p>An estimated ten territories were considered present within the MBS survey boundary during the 2019 breeding season (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Redshank: breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Redshank is listed as an Amber BoCC due to a moderate population and range decline over the last 25 years. The UK population is estimated at 25,000 pairs (Musgrove et al. 2013).</p> <p>An estimated two territories were considered present within the MBS survey boundary during the 2019 breeding season (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>Although the Proposed Development will result in disturbance during construction, given the small number of territories involved the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species during the breeding season.</p>	Y
Red-throated diver: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Red-throated diver is listed on Annex 1, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the Scottish Biodiversity List. This species is a Green listed BoCC. Scotland supports approximately 1,268 breeding pairs of red-throated diver, (Wilson et al. 2015) based on the national diver survey of 2006 (Dillon et al. 2009). The NHZ3 population is estimated at 317 pairs.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), up to five pairs of red-throated diver breed within the survey area.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 112 flights in 2018 and 94 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E). FW surveys recorded 165 flights in 2018 and 192 in 2019 (Appendix 8C (Wood. 2019) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B).</p> <p>Based on the data provided the survey area supports approximately 1.6% of the NHZ regional breeding and is considered to be of Regional importance for this species.</p>	N
Short-eared owl: breeding	International	Local	<p>Breeding short-eared owl is listed on Annex 1 of the Birds Directive and the SBL. It is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate decline in its breeding range.</p> <p>The Scottish population was estimated to be 1,088 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 281 in NHZ3. There is often large year-to-year variation in numbers present in any given area that is closely associated with the availability of prey items. A single occupied home range was found in 2017 by the SRMS on the Isles of Lewis and Harris (Challis et al. 2018a).</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			<p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8C), one possible breeding attempt was recorded in both years. VP surveys recorded five flights in 2018 and five in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding surveys in 2019 and assuming one occupied territory, the survey area supports approximately 0.3% of the NHZ regional breeding population and the survey area is considered to be of local importance for this species.</p>	
Snipe: breeding	Regional	Negligible	<p>Breeding snipe is an Amber listed BoCC due to a moderate decline in its breeding range. The Scottish population was estimated to be 34,594 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 6,780 in NHZ3.</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports between seven – 18 territories.</p> <p>Based on the data provided and assuming a maximum 18 occupied territories, the survey area supports approximately 0.26% of the NHZ regional breeding population and the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Teal: breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>Teal is not listed under any conservation designation as a breeding species within the UK. The Scottish breeding population was estimated to be between 1,950 – 3,400 pairs (Forester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to eight territories. VP surveys recorded two flights in 2018 and one in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Given the low levels of breeding activity and very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y
Teal: non-breeding	Negligible	Negligible	<p>One flight was recorded from VP surveys in 2017-18 (AI Appendix E). Given the very low levels of flight activity recorded, the survey area is considered to be of negligible importance for this species.</p>	Y

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
Whimbrel: breeding	National	Regional	<p>Breeding whimbrel is listed on Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This species is a Red BoCC due to its severe population and range decline as a breeding bird over the last 25 years.</p> <p>The Scottish population was estimated to be 307 pairs with an estimated 14 pairs in NHZ3 (Wilson et al. 2015),</p> <p>A single breeding record was observed within the MBS survey boundary in 2019 (AI Appendix 8C).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species, supporting c 7% of the NHZ population.</p>	N
White-tailed eagle: breeding	International	Regional	<p>Breeding white-tailed eagle is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedules 1, 1A and A1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the SBL. This species is a Red BoCC due to its rarity as a breeding bird and a historical decline in its breeding population.</p> <p>The Scottish population was estimated to be 82 pairs (Wilson et al. 2015), with an estimated 23 in NHZ3. Following the successful re-introduction of white-tailed eagle to Scotland (a recently published modelling study commissioned by SNH suggests that this population will continue to expand in range and numbers for the foreseeable future (Sansom et al. 2016), this species has re-colonised much of the Western Isles and is now regularly seen on the Isle of Lewis.</p> <p>On the Isle of Lewis and Harris 22 occupied territories were recorded in 2018 (Challis et al 2019).</p> <p>No territories were recorded within the 2km survey area during the 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B) 2019 breeding season. The nearest known nest site lies c. 5 km from the site boundary.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 15 flights in 2018 and 13 in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, although the survey area does not support any breeding territories, flight activity recorded indicate that the area is used by non-territorial birds during the breeding season and the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
White-tailed eagle: non-breeding	International	Regional	<p>As white-tailed eagle occupy their territories throughout the year their breeding status described previously can also be applied to territorial pairs during the non-breeding season.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 11 flights in 2017-18 and 17 in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, flight activity recorded indicate that the area is used by non-territorial birds throughout the year. Thus the survey area is considered to be of regional importance for this species.</p>	N
Whooper swan: breeding	International	National	<p>Whooper swan is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, Schedule 1 of the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and appears on the SBL. It is an Amber listed BoCC due to its rarity as a breeding species.</p> <p>The Scottish breeding population was estimated to be between 3-7 pairs (Forester et al. 2007).</p> <p>Based on the data provided from breeding season surveys in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8C) and 2019 (AI Appendix 8B), the survey area supports up to one territory.</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 0 flights in 2018 and two in 2019 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p> <p>Based on the data provided, the survey area is considered to be of national importance for this species, representing 14–33% of the national breeding population.</p>	N
Whooper swan: non-breeding	International	National	<p>Non-breeding whooper swan is listed on Annex I of the Birds Directive, the SBL and is an Amber listed BoCC due to at least 50% of the UK non-breeding population being located within 10 or less sites.</p> <p>Whooper swan is a regular winter visitor to the UK, which supports a population of an estimated 15,000 individuals (Musgrove et al. 2011), the majority of which migrate from breeding grounds in Iceland. It is estimated that Scotland supports 4,142 (Forester, 2007), whilst NHZ3 is estimated to support 813 individuals (Wilson et al. 2015).</p> <p>VP surveys recorded 6 flights (40 individuals) in 2017-18 and four (10 individuals) in 2018-19 within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E).</p>	N

Ecological Feature	Importance – Legislation & Policy	Importance – Proposed Development Survey Area	Justification	Scoped Out of Assessment (Y/N)
			Based on the data provided, the survey area supports approximately 4.9% of the NHZ non-breeding population and is thus considered to be of regional importance for this species.	

For those ecological features that remain scoped in following the process as described in **Table 8D.1**, the following are provided in **Table 8D.2**: description of the potential environmental change and associated effect (refer to Chapter 8 Section **8.7.6 – 8.7.9**); a description of the Zone of Influence for each ecological feature (refer to Chapter 8 Section **8.7.6 – 8.7.9** and **Table 8.8** (Wood. 2019)); justification of the decision to scope in or out each ecological feature based on the likely scale of the potential effect, general working measures (i.e. those covered within the Code of Construction Practice) that negate the effect and relevant information on the features status within the local, county, regional, national or international context where that is available.



Table 8D.2 Scoping of Ecological Features of Local or Above Importance and those Receiving Legal Protection

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: black throated Diver	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	A single breeding location and a number of lochs used by breeding birds from an additional two known breeding attempts for loafing or feeding fall within the ZoI (EIA Appendix D and AI Appendix C). Up to three breeding pairs could potentially be affected by construction activities, and assuming that all three pairs could be associated with the SPA population, this represents approximately 25% of the NHZ population. This may lead to potentially significant effects on the SPA population.
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minimal compared to those during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 750m of the Proposed Development footprint (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Breeding black-throated diver normally forage within large fresh-water lochs, and do not make regular commuting flights to and from the sea. However, flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect between breeding locations and feeding lochs, and it is considered that this will may result in a potentially significant effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development footprint (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.045 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.073 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.059 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This equates to the loss of 0.246% of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA/Ramsar however there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11 and combined with embedded mitigation measures this will mean that there will be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.</p>
Lewis Peatlands SPA: golden eagle	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	<p>No SPA golden eagle territories were found within 1km of the Proposed Development site, and no known historic nest sites are located within this range (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C).</p> <p>Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA golden eagle population.</p>
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	<p>Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.</p>
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	<p>PAT modelling indicates that there would be 1.8% (Pair A) and 5.7% (Pair B) overlap between available foraging habitat and the Zol for the two SPA pairs respectively (EIA Appendix 8.D).</p> <p>Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA golden eagle population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	CRM (AI Appendix 8E) indicates that there is potential for significant effects to occur on the SPA population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11,	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: greenshank	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Locations of breeding birds potentially associated with the SPA qualifying population fall within disturbance distance of proposed works and may result in a potentially significant effect to the SPA or Ramsar population (EIA Appendix D and AI Appendix C).

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect and it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.045 fatalities per year in 2018, and 0.0009 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.027 bird mortality per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This equates to the loss of 0.009% of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Lewis Peatlands SPA: merlin	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	A single breeding location was recorded that fell within the SPA boundary (EIA Appendix D and AI Appendix C). However, this did not fall within the ZoI, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA population.
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect and it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the SPA population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised Collision Risk Modelling (CRM) predicted a potential 0.016 fatalities per breeding season in 2018 and 0.029 in 2019 (equivalent to an average 0.023 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This equates to the loss of 0.057% of the SPA breeding population per year, and it is considered that this will not result in a detectable effect on the SPA population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.
Lewis Peatlands SPA / Ramsar: red-throated diver	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	One breeding location within the ZoI also falls within the SPA. Additionally, a second breeding location and a number of lochs used by breeding birds for loafing that may potentially be associated with the SPA qualifying feature fall within the ZoI (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C). The two breeding pairs represent approximately 2.5% of the SPA population, and therefore there may be potentially significant effects on the SPA population.
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given that the two breeding lochs within the ZoI are located less than 300m from operational turbines it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Breeding red-throated diver normally forage at sea, making regular commuting flights to and from breeding lochs inland. Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect to breeding red-throated diver, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the SPA or Ramsar population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	CRM investigating the impacts upon the SPA population predicted a potential 0.559 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.360 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.460 per year) (AI Appendix 8F). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.287% of the SPA breeding population and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the SPA population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	The 250m buffer extended on to the margins of the SPA however there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and combined with the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA or Ramsar population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the SPA population.</p>
Achmore Bog SSSI	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in temporary disturbance or displacement.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the Zol. However, it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the Zol. However, it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the Zol. However, it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Achmore Bog SSSI is located c 3.8km from the closest proposed infrastructure and outwith the Zol. However, it is one of the underlying features of the SPA and all qualifying features are accounted for in the SPA assessment.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	Site outwith the Zol and were no significant effects were identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11).
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	Site outwith the Zol.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Black-throated diver: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding black-throated diver.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	A single breeding location and a number of lochs used by breeding birds from an additional two known breeding attempts for loafing or feeding fall within the ZoI (EIA Appendix D and AI Appendix C). Up to three breeding pairs could potentially be affected by construction activities, which represents approximately 8.6% of the NHZ population. This may lead to potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minimal compared to that that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Breeding black-throated diver normally forage within large fresh-water lochs, and do not make regular commuting flights to and from the sea. However, flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect between breeding locations and feeding lochs, and it is considered that this will may result in a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.045 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.073 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.059 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This equates to the loss of 0.084% of the NHZ breeding population per year. It is considered that this will not lead to potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	Nest were outwith the ZoI, there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>Nests are outwith the Zol. Furthermore a Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.</p>
Common tern: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding common tern.	Within 250m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Proposed construction activities fall within approximately 367 m of the known breeding colony at its closest point (EIA Appendix D and AI Appendix C). This is outside of the Zol and it is therefore considered that there will be no detectable effect on the regional population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 250m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the regional population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect to breeding common tern, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the regional population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	CRM and flight activity (AI Appendix 8E) indicates that there is potential for significant effects to occur on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	Nest were outwith the ZoI, there were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	Nests are outwith the ZoI, and furthermore a Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the population.
Golden eagle: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding or foraging golden eagle.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007; Whitfield et al. 2008b).	N	No golden eagle territories were found within the recommended disturbance buffer of 1km from the Proposed Development site, and no known historic nest sites are located within this range (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C). Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ breeding golden eagle population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	PAT modelling (EIA Appendix 8D) indicates that there would be 1.8% (Pair A), 5.7% (Pair B) and 0.05% (Pair C) overlap between available foraging habitat and the Zol for the three NHZ pairs respectively. Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ golden eagle population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	When combined with the non-breeding CRM calculations and flight activity (AI Appendix 8E) there is potential for significant effects to occur on the Western Isles population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Golden eagle: non-breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding golden eagle.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	As golden eagle occupy their territories throughout the year the status described above can also be applied to territorial pairs during the non-breeding season.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 1000m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	PAT modelling (EIA Appendix 8D) indicates that there would be 1.8 % (Pair A), 5.7% (Pair B) and 0.05 % (Pair C) overlap between available foraging habitat and the Zol for the three NHZ pairs respectively. Therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ golden eagle population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	When combined with the breeding CRM calculations and flight activity (AI Appendix 8E) there is potential for significant effects to occur on the Western Isles population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
Great black-backed gull: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding great black-backed gull.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	<p>Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8C and AI Appendix 8B), 52 (2018) and 22 (2019) AON fall within the Zol representing a maximum of 1.5% of the NHZ population. Surveys indicated that some breeding colonies/sites were linked to the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site and its associated gull colonies and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the landfill. Therefore it is predicted that there will not be any potentially significant effects on the NHZ breeding population.</p>
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	<p>Given that existing nests fall within a 500m buffer of the operational Beinn Grideag wind farm, and disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.</p>
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	<p>There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
Great skua: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding great skua.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	<p>Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8C and AI Appendix 8B), 8 (2018) and 11 (2019) AON fall within the Zol representing a maximum of 3.9% of the NHZ population.</p> <p>This breeding activity is probably linked to the associated gull colonies and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the Development Site.</p> <p>Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.</p>
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be minimal compared to that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500 m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8C and AI Appendix 8B) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect, and that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.411 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.545 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.478 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.084% of the NHZ breeding population. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
Greenshank: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C), 4 (2018) and 6 (2019) territories fall within the ZoI representing a maximum 2.34% of the NHZ population. It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary.	N	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development would not cause a barrier effect, and that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.045 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.009 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.027 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.005% of the NHZ breeding population. Therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ breeding population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Hen harrier: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 750 m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Three breeding attempts fell within the Zol in 2018 (EIA Appendix 8D) and this increased to five in 2019 (AI Appendix 8C). Five pairs represents c 10.4% of the NHZ breeding population, 11.6% of the Western Isles breeding population and 50% of the Isle of Lewis population. It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ, Western Isles and Isle of Lewis population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ, Western Isles and Isle of Lewis population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary.	Y	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect, and that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ, Western Isles and Isle of Lewis population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	When combined with the non-breeding CRM calculations (AI Appendix 8E) there is potential for significant effects to occur on the Isle of Lewis population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
Hen harrier: non-breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding hen harrier.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	A single roosting location fell within the ZoI, utilised by at least 6 individual birds. This represents approximately 6.25% of the NHZ breeding population, 6.9% of the Western Isles breeding population and 33% of the Isle of Lewis population (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C). It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary.	Y	Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8B, 8D and AI Appendix 8A and 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may cause a barrier effect, and that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ non-breeding population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	When combined with the breeding CRM calculations (AI Appendix 8E) there is potential for significant effects to occur on the Western Isles population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EAI Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
Herring gull: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding herring gull.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	<p>Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8C and AI Appendix 8B), 170 (2018) and 297 (2019) AON fall within the Zol representing a maximum of 23.7% of the NHZ population. In addition, numbers were observed roosting in locations to the north and east of the Bennadrove Landfill and Civic Amenity Site, whilst the species contributed to a maximum mixed herring / great black-backed gull count of c. 500 individuals recorded utilising the area.</p> <p>If sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction, it is expected that they would relocate within the local area in the surrounding landscape, and it is anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
Lesser black-backed gull: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	<p>Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8C and AI Appendix 8B), 60 AON fell within the Zol in 2018, with none recorded within the Zol in 2019. This represents a maximum of 10.9% of the NHZ population.</p> <p>The breeding colonies recorded in 2018 were directly linked to the Bennadrove landfill site and if sensitive to disturbance from windfarm construction it is expected that they would relocate within the local areas surrounding the landfill. It is therefore anticipated that there will be no potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.</p>

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
Merlin: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding merlin.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No breeding locations fell within the ZoI, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.016 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.029 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.023 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.021% of the NHZ breeding population, and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Red-throated diver: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of breeding birds.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Two breeding locations and a number of lochs used by breeding birds for loafing fall within the Zol (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C). The two breeding pairs represent approximately 0.63% of the NHZ population, and therefore there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 750m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given that two breeding lochs are located less than 300m from operational turbines it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Breeding red-throated diver normally forage at sea, making regular commuting flights to and from breeding lochs inland. Flight activity recorded during surveys (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C) indicates that the Proposed Development may potentially cause a barrier effect to breeding red-throated diver, and this may result in a potentially significant effect to the NHZ population.
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.386 fatalities per breeding season in 2018, and 0.501 in 2019 (equivalent to an average of 0.444 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.07% of the NHZ breeding population and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
Whimbrel	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C), a single breeding territory fell within the ZoI in 2019 representing a maximum 7% of the NHZ population. It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 300m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	A lack of flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C).

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
White-tailed eagle: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of birds.	Within 2km of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No breeding pairs were recorded within 2km of the Proposed development footprint (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix C), and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 2km of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity data indicates that there may be potential for a significant effect on the NHZ population (AI Appendix 8E).
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a Zol of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
White-tailed eagle: non-breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of birds.	Within 2km of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No non-breeding birds were recorded utilising the survey area for roosting (EIA Appendix 8B, 8D and AI Appendix 8A and 8C), and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the non-breeding NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 2km of Proposed Development footprint.	N	Disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than during the construction phase, and therefore it is considered that there would be no detectable effects on the NHZ population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8B and AI Appendix 8A).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	Y	Flight activity data indicates that there may be potential for a significant effect on the NHZ population (AI Appendix 8E).
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
Whooper swan: breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of non-breeding birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	Y	Based on the distribution of breeding records (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C), a single breeding territory fell within the Zol in 2018 representing between 14-33% of the national breeding population. It is therefore predicted that there may be potentially significant effects on the national population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	Y	Although disturbance effects during the operational phase will be less than that experienced during the construction phase, given the proximity of operational turbines (50 m) breeding location it is considered that there may be a potentially significant effect on the national population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8D and AI Appendix 8C).
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Two flights were recorded within the CRZ (AI Appendix 8E), and given the low levels of activity, it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the national population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	<p>A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings.</p> <p>The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place.</p> <p>Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the NHZ population.</p>
Whooper swan: non-breeding	Construction activity including use of plant and the presence of workforce resulting in an increase in aural and visual stimuli due to noise and vibration, and movement of construction vehicles resulting in disturbance or displacement of non-breeding birds.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint (based on disturbance distances as described by Ruddock & Whitfield 2007).	N	No birds were recorded utilising habitats within the Proposed Development (EIA Appendix 8B and AI Appendix 8A), with records only being collected from over-flying individuals. It is therefore considered that there would be no detectable effects on the national wintering population.
	Potential disturbance and displacement to birds due to the operation of turbines and associated human activities for maintenance purposes.	Within 500m of Proposed Development footprint.	N	No birds were recorded utilising habitats within the Proposed Development, with records only being collected from over-flying individuals. It is therefore considered that there would be no detectable effects on the national wintering population.
	Operational displacement leading to barrier effects.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	Flight activity data indicates that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population (EIA Appendix 8B and AI Appendix 8A).

Ecological Feature	Environmental Change and potential effect	Zone of Influence	Scoped In (Y/N)	Justification
	Potential collision with operational turbines.	Within 500m of the Proposed Development boundary (based on guidance in SNH 2017).	N	The revised CRM predicted a potential 0.160 fatalities per non-breeding season in 2017-18, and 0.034 in 2018-19 (equivalent to an average of 0.097 per year) (AI Appendix 8E). This is equivalent to the potential loss of 0.012 % of the NHZ non-breeding population per year and therefore it is predicted that there will be no detectable effect on the NHZ population.
	Changes to surface hydrology leading to detrimental changes to species and habitats.	Within 250m (SEPA GUPS-LU31 250m) of the Development Site, and River catchments (River Laxdale, Glen River, River Creed) that intersect the Development Site.	N	There were no significant effects identified off-site (EIA Chapter 11) and with adoption of the embedded mitigation measures this means that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the wintering/passage population.
	Increased pollution risk associated with accidental spillage of fuels, oils, run-off and dust emission i.e. via direct contact, air or water, leading to harm or degradation to species and habitats.	EIA Chapter 15 (Section 15.4) of the Scoping Report detailed that air quality impacts associated with dust and particulate matter, and exhaust emissions from construction, operation and decommissioning activities have been scoped out of the EIA. For pollution incidents a ZoI of 250m was applied (see EIA Chapter 11).	N	A Construction and Environmental Management plan (CEMP) would include or be accompanied by a Water Management Plan (WMP), a Pollution Prevention Plan (PPP) and a Pollution Incident Response Plan (PIRP) for construction activities at the Development Site. The WMP would set out the specific details of surface water drainage, management of dewatered groundwater from excavations and watercourse crossings. The PPP would set out specific measures to protect water environment receptors from pollution arising from construction activities and a programme for inspection and monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of these measures. The PIRP would describe the response plan for pollution incidents, should accidental spillages occur despite the control measures in place. Therefore the embedded mitigation measures mean that there will be no detectable effects on the habitats supporting the wintering/passage population.

References

- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2016). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2015*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2018a). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2016*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Challis, A., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Roos, S., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2018b). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2017*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Challis, A., Eaton, M., Wilson, M.W., Holling, M., Stevenson, A. & Stirling-Aird, P. (2019). *Scottish Raptor Monitoring Scheme Report 2018*. BTO Scotland, Stirling.
- Dillon, A., Smith, T.D., Williams, S.J., Haysom, S. & Eaton, M.A. (2009) Status of red-throated divers *Gavia stellata* in Britain in 2006. *Bird Study* 56: 147-157.
- Eaton, M.A., Austin, G.E., Banks, A.N., Conway, G., Douse, A., Grice, P.V., Hearn, R., Hilton, G., Hoccom, D., Musgrove, A.J., Noble, D.G., Ratcliffe, N., Rehfisch, M.M., Worden, J. & Wotton, S. (2007). *The State of the UK's Birds 2006*. RSPB, BTO, WWT, CCW, EHS, NE & SNH. Sandy, Bedfordshire.
- Eaton, M.A., Brown, A.F., Noble, D.G., Musgrove, A.J., Hearn, R., Aebischer, N.J., Gibbons, D.W., Evans, A. & Gregory, R.D. (2009) Birds of Conservation Concern 3: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and the Isle of Man. *British Birds* 102: 296-341.
- Eaton, M., Aebischer, N., Brown, A., Hearn, R., Lock, L., Musgrove, A., Noble, D., Stroud, D., A. and Gregory R. (2015). 'Birds of Conservation Concern 4: the population status of birds in the United Kingdom, Channel Islands and the Isle of Man.' *British Birds* 108, pp 708-746.
- Forrester, R.W., Andrews, I. J., McInerney, C. J., Murray, R. D., McGowan, R.Y., Zonfrillo, B., Betts, M.W., Jardine, D. C., & Grundy, D. S. 2007. *The Birds of Scotland*. SOC, Aberlady.
- Hagemeyer W.J.M. & Blair M.J. (eds) 1997. *The EBCC Atlas of European Breeding Birds: Their distribution and abundance*. T & A Poyser, London.
- Hancock, M.H., Gibbons, D.W. and Thompson, P.S. (1997). The status of breeding greenshank *Tringa nebularia* in the United Kingdom in 1995. *Bird Study* 44: 290-302.
- Hayhow, D.B., Benn, S., Stevenson, A., StirlingAird, P.K. & Eaton, M.A. (2017). Status of Golden Eagle *Aquila chrysaetos* in Britain in 2015. *Bird Study* 64: 281-294.
- Humphreys, E.M., Gillings, S., Musgrove, A., Austin, G., Marchant, J. & Calladine, J. 2016. An update of the review on the impacts of piscivorous birds on salmonid populations and game fisheries in Scotland. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 884.
- Mitchell, P.I., Newton, S.F., Ratcliffe, N. & Dunn, T.E., (2004), *Seabird Populations of Britain and Ireland*. JNCC.
- Mitchell, C., Griffin, L., Trinder, M., Newth, J. & Urquhart, C. (2011) The status and distribution of summering Greylag Geese *Anser anser* in Scotland, 2008–09, *Bird Study*, 58:3, 338-348, DOI: 10.1080/00063657.2011.585629.
- Musgrove, A.J., Austin, G. E., Hearn, R.D., Holt, C.A., Stroud, D.A. and Wotton, S.R. (2011). Overwinter population estimates of British waterbirds. *British Birds* 104: 364-397.

Musgrove, A., Aebischer, N., Eaton, M., Hearn, R., Newson, S., Noble, D., Parsons, M., Risely, K., & Stroud, D. (2013). Population estimates of birds in Great Britain and the United Kingdom. *British Birds* 106. February 2013: 64–100.

Sansom, A., Evans, R. & Roos, S. (2016). *Population and future range modelling of reintroduced Scottish white-tailed eagles (Haliaeetus albicilla)*. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No. 898.

Scottish Natural Heritage (2017). Recommended bird survey methods to inform impact assessment of onshore wind farms.

Whitfield, D P, Fielding, A H, McLeod, D R A and Haworth, P F (2008). *A conservation framework for golden eagles: implications for their conservation and management in Scotland*. Scottish Natural Heritage Commissioned Report No.193 (ROAME No. F05AC306).

Wilson, M. W., Austin, G. E., Gillings S. and Wernham, C. V. (2015). Natural Heritage Zone Bird Population Estimates. SWBSG Commissioned report number SWBSG_1504. pp72. Available from: www.swbsg.org

Wotton, S.R., Eaton, M., Ewing, S.R., & Green, R.E. (2015) The increase in the Corncrake *Crex crex* population of the United Kingdom has slowed, *Bird Study*, 62:4, 486-497, DOI: 10.1080/00063657.2015.1089837.