

East Anglia THREE

Appendix 49

East Anglia THREE Cefas Meeting
Minutes – 26th June 2014

Consultation Report

Document Reference – 5.2 (49)

Author – Royal HaskoningDHV
East Anglia THREE Limited
Date – November 2015
Revision History – Revision A



This Page Is Intentionally Blank

Table of Contents

49	Appendix Ex East Anglia THREE Cefas Meeting Minutes – 26th June 2014	1
49.1	Introductions.....	3
49.2	Shark By-watch.....	3
49.3	Fish and Shellfish Ecology.....	4
49.4	Cumulative Impact Assessment.....	5
49.5	Commercial Fisheries	6
49.6	AOB.....	6

49 APPENDIX EX EAST ANGLIA THREE CEFAS MEETING MINUTES – 26TH JUNE 2014

1. This appendix contains the minutes of the Cefas meeting to discuss East Anglia THREE Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Commercial Fisheries PEIR. The meeting was held on the 26th of June 2014. Minutes were originally compiled by Brown and May Marine Ltd.
2. The minutes have been adapted from the original so individuals are redacted.

Brown & May Marine Ltd.

East Anglia THREE Cefas Meeting Minutes – 26th June 2014

Brown & May Marine Ltd.

Progress Way, Mid Suffolk Business Park, Eye, Suffolk, IP23 7HU, UK Tel: +44 (0)1379 870181
Fax: +44 (0) 1379 870673
www.browndanmaymarine.com

Meeting Title	East Anglia THREE Cefas meeting
Attendees	EAOW BMM Cefas
Purpose of meeting	To discuss East Anglia THREE Fish and Shellfish Ecology and Commercial Fisheries PEIR.
Agenda	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introductions 2. Shark By-watch 3. Fish and Shellfish Ecology 4. Cumulative Impact Assessment 5. Commercial Fisheries 6. AOB

49.1 Introductions

1. All present gave a brief introduction of their role in the East Anglia THREE development process.

49.2 Shark By-watch

1. Cefas explained that as spurdog have been raised as an issue by local fishermen, Cefas will provide a presentation on Shark By-Watch.
2. BMM thanked Cefas for providing a draft executive summary of the Shark By-Watch study, however, this was received after the PEIR deadline, and the data will be included into the final ES where appropriate.
3. Cefas explained that the final Shark By-watch report should be available by the end of July 2014. Cefas added that all Shark By-watch data will become live via interactive mapping after internal QA.
4. Cefas stated that due to the forthcoming discard ban as part of the CFP reform, fishermen may have to land all spurdogs that they catch by 2017. This is a problem because spurdog are currently a critically endangered species. Cefas are currently looking into a pilot study whereby fishermen will be taught how to handle spurdog and remove hooks in order to return any spurdog caught via longline fishing to the sea alive and increase their survivability. There is currently an EU ban on landing spurdogs.

5. Cefas are doing a study on release survivability if spurdog are returned to sea alive via a tagging program. In April 2013, 26 spurdogs were tagged with pop-off DSP tags, however, no tags have been returned to date.
6. Cefas stated that Shark By-Watch data was collected via action based workshops with local fishermen ().
7. Local fishermen, scientists and policy advisors had various meetings to discuss Shark By- Watch. Shark By-Watch sample sites were suggested by the local fishermen involved (i.e. where they had caught spurdog previously). Six local vessels were used for the Shark By- Watch study, sampling over 140 locations, 1,808 healthy sharks were tagged and released. Within the local region, 65% of the catch recorded was Thornback ray.
8. A local fishermen provided his logbook data to Cefas from December- May 2013 for ICES rectangle 34F2.
9. Cefas explained that Shark By-Watch II will be a nationwide project.

49.3 Fish and Shellfish Ecology

1. BMM provided a presentation of the Fish and Shellfish Ecology PEIR.
2. Cefas stated that there is an error in section 11.5.6, stating that herring spawning occurs within the East Anglia THREE zone, this needs to be amended for the ES.
3. Cefas requested that spurdogs are discussed separately due to their conservation status, rather than a general elasmobranch section.
4. Cefas requested that the spawning seasonality table is amended, with spurdog changing to 'gravid females present year round', and herring changed to 'N/A'.
5. Cefas explained that cod spawning according to Ellis et al., 2012 is very wide spread, and is low intensity within East Anglia THREE, with high intensity spawning off the north of Scotland. Cefas stated that there have been records of cod aggregations off the east coast, but in April/ May cod move further north. Cefas stated that there has been a cod tagging program conducted by IFCA. EAOW to contact IFCA for cod tagging data.
6. BMM stated that there is no noise range overlap with herring spawning grounds, in addition soft start piling will be utilised. Cefas explained that herring spawning should not be an issue for East Anglia THREE as the Downs herring stock is the most

productive herring stock in the North Sea. Cefas stated that IFCA studies of herring show very small landings off the east coast.

7. CF explained that East Anglia THREE does not overlap with the main sandeel habitat depicted in Jensen et al., 2011. However, due to their limited mobility & substrate dependence, sandeel sensitivity to increased SSC's is medium. Cefas agreed that East Anglia THREE does not overlap the key fishing grounds for sandeel but stated that there may be patchy sandeel distribution which may be important for predators in that area. AR explained that older sandeels spend more time within the substrate whereas younger sandeels come into the pelagic zone more often.
8. Regarding EMFs, Cefas questioned what monitoring there will be to ensure cable is buried to 0.5m. EAOW stated that there will be post installation surveys to check that cables remain buried.
9. VB questioned if East Anglia THREE will check if fishing can continue once the cable is installed. EAOW explained that there will be a detailed geotechnical survey to determine the most suitable cable route (e.g. if the cable is buried in 0.5m of London clay, the cable will remain there, whereas, if the cable is buried in 0.5m of mobile sand, it may become unburied). There will be a cable burial plan which will be discussed with local fishermen. EAOW stated that there is a requirement for East Anglia THREE to provide a cable specification and installation plan within the DML, including a contingency plan should cables become unburied. KW stated that East Anglia THREE want the cables to stay buried as an unburied cable is exposed to risk and if damaged there would be lost revenue from the windfarm. Cefas requested that information regarding different sediment types and cable burial depths should be added into the ES- e.g. explain that burial in 0.5m of clay is better than 5m of sand.
10. Cefas stated that they have before and after data for London Array which can be passed on to EAOW.

49.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment

1. Cefas requested that inter-relationships are adequately covered.
2. Cefas requested that cumulative impacts of foreign infrastructure should also be assessed (e.g. Belgian/Dutch/Danish wind farms).

3. Cefas questioned what construction activity will be overlapping for East Anglia THREE and East Anglia FOUR. BMM explained that there will be no piling overlap, but can provide further detail on what activities may overlap within the ES.
4. Cefas stated that they do not recognise DBht noise modelling.

49.5 Commercial Fisheries

1. Cefas questioned why there has been no consultation to the north of Lowestoft. BMM explained that there are currently no vessels to the north of Lowestoft actively targeting East Anglia THREE.
2. Cefas suggested adding a section into the ES regarding how the CFWG operates, its purpose etc.
3. AR questioned why Belgian fisheries statistics are only presented up to 2010, whereas most other nationalities are to 2012. BMM explained that despite numerous requests, the Belgians have not provided the updated data, and a sentence explaining this will be added into the ES.

49.6 AOB

1. EATL thanked everybody for attending.

Appendix 49 Ends Here