

APPENDIX H

FINAL ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

Table H1 Ranking of options following final assessment and summary of criteria used (see subsequent tables for explanation of codes/categories)

Rank	Water body name	Reach #	MCA score	Local morphology benefit class	Cost band	Likely land take required	Highest LCA value in reach	Critical infrastructure affected
1	Dee - Peterculter to tidal limit	3	73	5	5	yes	32	1
2	Tarland Burn	4	42	3	4	yes	32	0
3	Leuchar Burn	2	43	3	4	yes	32	0
4	Gormack Burn	2	37	4	4	yes	32	0
5	Brodiach Burn / Ord Burn	1	38	2	3	yes	32	0
6	Dess Burn - upper	1	35	2	3	yes	32	0
7	Kinnernie Burn	2	31	3	4	yes	32	1
8	Kinnernie Burn	1	31	1	3	yes	32	1
9	Bo Burn	2	30	2	4	yes	32	0
10	Gormack Burn	1	30	3	4	yes	32	1
11	Beltie Burn	3	26	2	2	yes	32	0
12	Beltie Burn	1	28	2	3	yes	32	0
13	Beltie Burn	2	28	4	4	yes	31	1
14	Brodiach Burn / Ord Burn	2	28	2	4	yes	32	1
15	Kinnernie Burn	4	27	2	4	yes	32	0
16	Gormack Burn	4	27	1	4	yes	32	0
17	Tarland Burn	5	28	2	4	yes	31	1
18	Tarland Burn	3	24	2	3	yes	32	0
19	Dess Burn - upper	2	22	1	2	yes	32	0
20	Dess Burn - upper	3	22	1	2	yes	32	0
21	Bo Burn	4	23	2	3	yes	32	0
22	Kinnernie Burn	5	26	2	4	yes	32	1
23	Bo Burn	5	21	2	4	yes	32	0
24	Leuchar Burn	1	21	1	3	yes	32	0
25	Gormack Burn	3	18	2	4	yes	32	0
26	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	1	19	1	3	yes	32	0
27	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	4	20	1	4	yes	31	0
28	Water of Feugh-lower catchment	1	17	1	2	no	32	0
29	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	5	19	1	4	yes	31	0

River Dee restoration, cbec UK Ltd, October 2013

Rank	Water body name	Reach #	MCA score	Local morphology benefit class	Cost band	Likely land take required	Highest LCA value in reach	Critical infrastructure affected
30	Water of Feugh-lower catchment	3	14	2	2	yes	32	0
31	Bo Burn	6	18	1	4	yes	32	1
32	Gormack Burn	5	16	2	4	yes	32	1
33	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	6	14	1	4	no	31	0
34	Kinnernie Burn	3	16	1	4	yes	32	0
35	Dess Burn - upper	5	9	1	1	maybe	32	0
36	Water of Feugh-lower catchment	2	8	1	1	yes	32	0
37	Water of Feugh-lower catchment	4	7	1	1	yes	32	0
38	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	2	9	1	4	no	32	0
39	Dee - Peterculter to tidal limit	2	22	2	5	yes	31	1
40	Dess Burn / Lumphanan Burn	1	33	3	3	yes	32	2
41	Tarland Burn	1	33	2	3	yes	32	2
42	Dee - Peterculter to tidal limit	1	25	2	4	yes	32	2
43	Brodiach Burn / Ord Burn	3	19	1	3	yes	32	2
44	Dee - Banchory to Peterculter	7	13	1	3	no	32	2
45	Dess Burn / Lumphanan Burn	2	14	1	4	yes	32	2

Table H2 Local morphology benefit class*

Class	Meaning
1	Low
2	Moderately low
3	Moderate
4	Moderately high
5	High

* Based on MImAS capacity released without weighting for water body length

Table H4 Cost bands used in assessment

Cost band	Cost range (£k)
1	<50
2	50-100
3	100-200
4	200-500
5	>500

Table H5 Land capability for agriculture categories

Class	Division	Key points
1	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land capable of producing a very wide range of crops • The level of yield is consistently high • Climate is favourable • No or only very minor physical limitations affecting agricultural use
2	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land capable of producing a wide range of crops. • The level of yield is high but less consistently obtained than on Class 1 land due to the effects of minor limitations • Slightly unfavourable soil structure or texture • Slightly unfavourable climate • The limitations are always minor in their effect however and land in the class is highly productive.
3	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land capable of producing a moderate range of crops. • Land in this class is capable of producing good yields of a narrow range of crops • Degree of variability between years will be greater than is the case for Classes 1 and 2 • Unfavourable structure or texture • The range of soil types within the class is greater than for previous classes.
	3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of producing consistently high yields of a narrow range of crops) and/or moderate yields of a wider range • Short grass leys are common.

River Dee restoration, cbec UK Ltd, October 2013

Class	Division	Key points
	3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capable of average production but high yields of barley, oats and grass are often obtained. • Grass leys are common
4	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land capable of producing a narrow range of crops. • Yields of arable crops are variable due to soil, wetness/ climatic factors • Yields of grass are often high • Moderately severe climate • Shallow or very stony soils
	4.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in this division is suited to rotations • Yields of grass are high but difficulties of utilization and conservation may be encountered.
	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is primarily grassland with some limited potential for other crops. • Difficulties of conservation or utilisation may be severe, especially in areas of poor climate or on very wet soils.
5	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land suited only to improved grassland and rough grazing • Land capable of use as improved grassland. • One or more severe limitations render the land unsuited to arable cropping (e.g climate, soil defects)
	5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass sward and its maintenance present few problems and potential yields are high with ample growth throughout the season. • High stocking rates are possible.
	5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sward establishment presents no difficulties but moderate or low trafficability, patterned land and/or strong slopes cause maintenance problems. • Growth rates are high and despite some problems of poaching satisfactory stocking rates are achievable.
	5.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serious trafficability and poaching difficulties and although sward establishment may be easy, deterioration in quality is often rapid. • The land cannot support high stock densities without damage
6	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land capable only of use as rough grazing. • land has very severe site, soil or wetness limitations • Climate is often a very significant limiting factor. • Land affected by severe industrial pollution or dereliction may be included if the effects of the pollution are non-toxic.
	6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land in this division has high proportions of palatable herbage in the sward, principally the better grasses, e.g. meadow grass-bent grassland and bent-fescue grassland.
	6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderate quality herbage such as white and flying bent grasslands, rush pastures and herb-rich moorlands or mosaics of high and low grazing values characterise land in this division.
	6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This vegetation is dominated by plant communities with low grazing values. Particularly heather moor, bog heather moor and blanket bog.
7	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land of very limited agricultural value. Land with extremely severe limitations that cannot be rectified. • Agricultural use is restricted to very poor rough grazing.

Table H6 Critical infrastructure code

Class	Meaning
0	No impact on critical infrastructure
1	presence of critical infrastructure prevents full implementation of option, but the option could be modified to avoid the infrastructure, with significant benefit retained (e.g. set back embankments, rather than full removal)
2	presence of critical infrastructure prevents implementation of option