

AQUACULTURE MODELLING SCREENING & RISK IDENTIFICATION REPORT: Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)

Version One: April 2020

Every day SEPA works to protect and enhance Scotland's environment, helping communities and businesses thrive within the resources of our planet.



We call this **One Planet Prosperity**

For information on accessing this document in an alternative format or language please either contact SEPA by telephone on 03000 99 66 99 or by email to equalities@sepa.org.uk

If you are a user of British Sign Language (BSL) the Contact Scotland BSL service gives you access to an online interpreter enabling you to communicate with us using sign language.

<http://contactscotland-bsl.org/>

www.sepa.org.uk

03000 99 66 99

Strathallan House, Castle Business Park, Stirling, FK9 4TZ

Scope of report

As part of the SEPA Aquaculture Regulatory Framework it is recommended that a proposed application for a marine fin fish aquaculture site should undergo a Screening Modelling and Risk Identification process. SEPA carries out this work and this is described on the SEPA aquaculture website Pre-application section:

[\(https://www.sepa.org.uk/regulations/water/aquaculture/pre-application/\)](https://www.sepa.org.uk/regulations/water/aquaculture/pre-application/)

This report presents information arising from that process. Screening modelling methods are outlined and maps and tables describing the modelled outputs are shown. Risks arising from consideration of the model output are listed. Conclusions and recommendations are made regarding the proposed site.

Executive summary

SEPA has received a proposal for a semi enclosed marine fin fish aquaculture site called Beinn Reithe (BNRT1). This is located within Loch Long, at location: 225528, 699285 (Easting, Northing). There is no existing site at this location and the proposed weight of fish to be farmed is 4000t. As this is a novel semi enclosed farm, CFD modelling is to be undertaken to assess the proportion of waste expected to be captured. As this proportion is currently unknown, screening modelling has been done to investigate the risks associated with 90%, 50% and 0% waste capture. No medicines are being applied for due to the semi – enclosed nature of the farm, therefore no screening modelling of bath medicines have been undertaken.

Following screening modelling and risk identification we have concluded the following:

- It is possible that discharges from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) will be able to comply with the relevant aspects of the SEPA Aquaculture Regulatory Framework. This is dependent on the results of the CFD modelling, and the percentage of waste capture demonstrated to be realistic. A standard 4000t (i.e. not semi – enclosed) farm would not be suitable for this area as the slow flow dynamics are not suitable for this large biomass.
- Features at risk, identified at this stage, do not appear to influence the feasibility of the proposed site with respect to the regulatory framework. These risks should be examined using a 2D marine model.
- Nutrient influence has been identified as a potential risk from this farm. Marine modelling should be undertaken to examine this risk.
- Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) is suitable to progress to the next stage of the pre-application process. For this semi enclosed novel farm, a CFD modelling method statement will be required as the first step. Once CFD modelling has been completed, this screening report will be updated to reflect any perceived changes to the risk.

List of abbreviations

SEPA Scottish Environment Protection Agency

List of chemical abbreviations

AZA Azamethiphos
NEI Nutrient Enhancement Index
STW Sewage Treatment Works

Contents

1	Introduction	8
1.1	The objectives of screening modelling and risk identification	8
1.2	Screening modelling methods	9
2	Screening modelling	12
2.1	Site proposal	12
2.2	Dispersion and erosion capacity maps	12
2.3	Sediment influence maps and analysis for 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm).	14
2.4	Sediment influence maps and analysis for 50% waste capture.	16
2.5	Sediment influence maps and analysis for 90% waste capture.	18
2.6	Bath medicine influence maps and analysis for 0% waste capture (i.e. a standard farm).	19
3	Risk identification	32
3.1	Identified features which require attention	32
3.2	Additional comments on identified features	33
3.3	Risks identified due to novel semi enclosed farm	33
3.4	Potential risks due to increased nutrient release	34
4	Conclusion of screening modelling and risk identification.	36
4.1	Conclusions	36
4.2	Recommendations	37
5	References	38

List of Figures

Figure 1: Firth of Clyde (FOC) model grid.....	11
Figure 2: Modelled average water speed (metres per second – m/s) in the sea area surrounding the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).	22
Figure 3: Modelled percentage of time the water flow speed is above 0.095 m/s in the sea area surrounding the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).	23
Figure 4: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm).....	24
Figure 5: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm) and other relevant sites.	25
Figure 6: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 50% waste capture.....	26
Figure 7: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 50% waste capture and other relevant sites.	27
Figure 8: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 90% waste capture.....	28
Figure 9: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 90% waste capture and other relevant sites.	29
Figure 10: Modelled average Azamethiphos concentration over four days from neap tide release for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).....	30
Figure 11: Modelled average Azamethiphos concentration over four days from neap tide release for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)) and other relevant sites.	31
Figure 12. Shapefiles of identified features around the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).	33

List of Tables

Table 1: Sediment influence information for each site, where 0% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).....	15
Table 2: Sediment influence information for each site, where 50% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).....	17
Table 3: Sediment influence information for each site, where 90% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).....	19
Table 4: Azamethiphos influence information for each site, where 0% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).....	21
Table 5: Table of identified features	32

1 Introduction

Screening Modelling and Risk Identification are important steps in the SEPA regulatory framework for marine pen fish farms. They are carried out by SEPA at the pre-application stage, which is described in detail at:

<https://www.sepa.org.uk/regulations/water/aquaculture/pre-application/>.

This document briefly describes the objectives of screening and risk identification and summarises the methods used. Screening output for the proposed site is then presented with comments. Risks identified from the screening output are detailed. Conclusions and recommendations about the suitability of the proposed site are then made.

1.1 The objectives of screening modelling and risk identification

A summary of the modelling methods employed during screening modelling is outlined in section 1.2. The objectives of screening modelling and risk identification are outlined below.

1.1.1 Screening modelling

Marine Modelling technology can be used to simulate and predict the potential influence of discharges on the marine environment. SEPA will require the majority of proposed farms to conduct **detailed** marine modelling, as outlined in our Aquaculture Modelling guidance [1] and on the SEPA Website.

Marine modelling can also be used at an earlier stage to provide an initial estimate of the influence of material discharged from a proposed site.

SEPA will carry out marine modelling at the screening and risk identification stage. This is a simplified version of the detailed modelling required of the applicant. However, it will be sufficient to perform an initial risk assessment of a proposal. Screening marine modelling will also include discharges from other relevant aquaculture sites and major sources.

The objectives of the simplified screening modelling are to:

- Produce maps of the predicted dispersive and erosive capacity of the sea areas in the vicinity of aquaculture sites
- Produce maps of the predicted spread of sediment discharged from aquaculture sites
- Produce maps of the predicted spread of bath treatment medicines from aquaculture sites
- Present an analysis of the potential influence of sediment and bath treatment discharges from the proposed site alongside existing sites within the surrounding sea area
- Present information on the sensitive features and sites of interest within the surrounding sea area, which must be addressed during pre-application work
- Present a summary of the suitability of the proposal with respect to the dispersal of waste and how this may be modelled.

1.1.2 Risk identification

Maps and analysis of screening output will be compared to information relating to sensitive features and relevant areas of interest. These may include:

- Marine Protected Area (MPA)
- Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
- Priority Marine Feature (PMF)
- Any site identified via consideration of other permitted or regulatory activities.

SEPA Staff will meet to discuss screening model output and the relevant sensitive features information. Following this meeting, a list of identified risks will be added to this report.

1.1.3 Conclusion of screening modelling and risk identification

Following the identification of risks, SEPA will present a summary of the suitability of the proposal with respect to the:

- Dispersal of waste from the proposed site and other sources
- Risks posed to sensitive features
- Likely level of modelling that will be required to address the risks identified.

1.2 Screening modelling methods

Marine models divide the sea up into a “grid” of boxes or triangles (often called cells). Each of these is given a water depth. For the screening modelling presented in this report the Marine Scotland “Firth of Clyde” (FOC) has been used. An image of the FOC model grid is shown in Figure 1. This grid has been set up within a marine modelling software package called MIKE 21 which is manufactured by the company DHI A/S (<https://www.dhigroup.com/>).

Marine models carry out calculations across a grid to work out how seawater moves and mixes in response to tidal and weather forces. Marine models can also be used to simulate how seawater moves and mixes due to salinity and temperature differences across an area, particularly in response to inputs of freshwater from rivers. For pollutant influence assessments the mixing (dispersion) of dissolved (bath medicine) and particulate (sediment) pollutants can also be estimated. Calculations within a marine model can be performed in three dimensions (3D), where the grid is split into layers to better represent how properties of the sea change with depth. Two dimensional (2D) models can also be created where processes over the water depth are simplified. The amount of mixing in a marine model can be varied using settings in the software.

Screening modelling is currently carried out with 2D models using average mixing settings in the model software. In many areas, this approach will be sufficient to make an initial estimate of the influence of a proposed site. Our screening assessment will take into account factors which may limit a 2D approach. We will also consider whether a particular location is adequately represented by the available models.

1.2.1 Water movement and mixing modelling

Water movement and mixing modelling (hydrodynamics) has been carried out to generate one month of results. The boundaries (edge(s) of) the model have been driven using the “wider domain” Scottish Shelf Model [2]. Wind forces and freshwater inputs have been applied to the model from the same source. The results generated are an estimate of the average water movement and mixing conditions within the model area.

1.2.2 Sediment waste modelling

Screening modelling provides a precautionary and **indicative** estimate of the size, location and intensity of waste organic material released from aquaculture sites.

The release of sediment from sources within the model area is simulated using one month of hydrodynamic results along with particle tracking modelling technology. Virtual particles are continually introduced to the model grid to represent the potential dispersion of sediment from the sources. Particles in the model are moved and mixed by the hydrodynamics. Additionally, particles are assigned simplified properties, which allow them to settle through the water and be re-suspended (eroded and lifted) from the sea bed.

1.2.3 Bath medicine modelling

Screening modelling provides a precautionary and **indicative** estimate of the size, location and concentration of bath medicine releases.

The release of bath treatment medicine from sources within the model area is simulated using hydrodynamic results along with particle tracking modelling technology. Virtual particles are introduced to the model grid to represent the potential dispersion of bath medicines from the sources. Particles in the model are moved and mixed by the hydrodynamics. Releases of bath medicines are simulated under worst case mixing (dispersion) conditions, which occur under neap tides. The maximum treatment amount likely to be used at each site is released into the model at the same time and plumes are tracked over the following 96 hours (4 days). Treatment amounts used at screening have been derived from an analysis of historical data. Additionally, all bath medicine particles are concentrated within the top 5 m of the sea area. As all bath medicines are likely to disperse in a similar way, only Azamethiphos (AZA) would normally be modelled at the screening stage. As this is a semi enclosed farm, no medicines are being applied for, and therefore screening for Azamethiphos has not been undertaken.

1.2.4 Nutrient assessment

Whilst nutrients are not directly modelled during screening, the dispersion of bath medicine releases will give an indication of the likely level of nutrient dispersion. This will be considered alongside any pre-existing nutrient assessment information that may be available.

1.2.5 Analysis of modelling output

SEPA processes the screening modelling output and places it into a standard analysis application built in [TIBCO Spotfire](#). The application allows for the production of standard maps and tables, which are presented below.




Figure 1: Firth of Clyde (FOC) model grid.

2 Screening modelling

Please note that all maps are collated at the end of this section.

2.1 Site proposal

Screening modelling has been carried out for a proposed new semi - enclosed farm: Beinn Reithe (BNRT1). The proposal is to site the farm at location: 225528, 699285 (Easting, Northing). The proposed weight of the fish to be farmed at this location is 4000 tonnes. For the screening modelling presented here all relevant licenced sites have been modelled in conjunction with the proposed new site. CFD (Computational Fluid Dynamics) modelling is to be undertaken to assess the proportion of waste expected to be captured. As this proportion is currently unknown, screening has been done to investigate the risks associated with 90%, 50% and 0% waste capture. No medicines are being applied for due to the semi – enclosed nature of the site, therefore no bath medicine screening modelling has been undertaken. Instead, we have used bath medicine modelling output to examine the potential influence on nutrients released from the farm.

2.1.1 Accuracy of model in the area surrounding the proposed site

The Firth of Clyde model used for screening modelling has been compared against various sources of observed current meter data. This comparison indicates that the model provides a reasonable description of the physical processes in the vicinity of the proposed site. However, due to the sea loch nature of the area of interest our tools may overestimate the amount of mixing of non-sediment material.

2.2 Dispersion and erosion capacity maps

Modelled water movement in a sea area can be analysed and presented to show the capacity of the water to move and disperse discharged substances. It is also possible to show the capacity available to erode substances from the seabed. This information is a useful guide to the potential size of a marine fin fish aquaculture farm at a particular location.

Marine fin fish aquaculture farms using open-net pens will benefit from operating in locations where there are strong, repeating, water currents to erode and disperse waste.

For the purposes of screening we consider locations which meet the following water flow criteria to be generally suitable for larger farms:

Locations with average water flow speeds of greater than, or equal to, 0.12 metres per second (0.23 knots)

Locations where water flow speeds are often above the threshold of 0.095 meters per second (0.18 knots).

Locations with these properties are likely to disperse discharged material rapidly, and regularly erode sediment discharged to the seabed. In general, we would look for these properties to be maintained over a large area around a proposed site.

The thresholds stated above are indicative.

A map of modelled average water flow speed for the area surrounding the proposed site is shown in Figure 2. The average water flow speed in each cell of the model grid (see section 1.2) has been assigned a shade. The key for the shading is shown in the top left of the figure. Grid cells that have average speeds less than 0.12 m/s (metres per second) are marked on the figure. The greater the shading, the slower the average current speed and the lower the capacity for dispersion.

Figure 3 is a map of the percentage of time the modelled water flow speed in a grid cell is above 0.095 m/s (metres per second). The greater the shading, the lower the capacity for material to be eroded from the seabed.

Licensed aquaculture farms in the vicinity of the proposed site are also marked on Figure 2 and Figure 3. Discharges of material from these sites have been included in the screening modelling.

Based on the maps of the modelled water flow properties we can make the following observations about the proposed site location:

- It lies in a low dispersion area.
- It lies in an area where water flow has a low capacity to erode material on the seabed.

2.3 Sediment influence maps and analysis for 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm).

Modelled particles in a sea area can be analysed for each modelled grid cell and presented to show the potential influence of discharged sediment on the surrounding sea area.

2.3.1 Sediment influence maps

Figure 4 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month (time average) for the proposed site only, assuming no waste capture occurs. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2).

Values less than $1 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ have been excluded from the map and subsequent calculations. These low concentration cells are produced by the particle tracking approach but they are not considered to be representative of the main influence of a discharge.

The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure. Cells which are shaded black are similar to the average intensity in the total area of influence shown in the map. Cells shaded pink are similar to the median (middle value in the range) intensity value shown on the map. White shaded cells are similar to the minimum intensity value shown on the map.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $857.03 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $345.00 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- Cells influenced by the proposed site do not appear to lie close to existing farm sites.

Figure 5 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site and other relevant sites. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2). The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure and is in a similar format as that shown in Figure 4. The average sediment intensity, after including all relevant sites, is increased.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $542.26 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $177.34 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- Cells influenced by existing sites do not appear to lie close to the proposed site.

2.3.2 Sediment influence analysis

Model grid cells can be analysed to estimate the size and concentration of the potential sediment influence from the modelled sites.

- The total area of sediment influenced by the three sites modelled is estimated to be $0.11 \text{ square kilometres (km}^2\text{)}$.
- As shown in Figure 5, the average and median intensity over this area are $542.26 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $177.34 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- The total weight of fish that generates this modelled influence is 4500 tonnes .

Table 1 shows the information for each individual site modelled. It is important to note that the total area of influence for all sites is not the sum of the numbers in Table 1. The total area of influence worked out above takes into account that the individual areas of influence from different sites will overlap.

Table 1: Sediment influence information for each site, where 0% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).

Site Name	Average Intensity (g/m ²)	Area of Influence (km ²)	Median Intensity (g/m ²)	Max weight Of Fish (tonnes)
BNRT1	857.03	0.06	345.00	4000 (with 0% waste capture)
FFMC76	137.74	0.05	163.14	500

There are no Environmental Standards for sediment intensity. However, we consider that:

- underneath farm pens, an intensity of 2000 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed ecological outcome
- at the edge of the mixing zone, an intensity of 250 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed mixing zone outcome

The estimate of influence detailed above is indicative. The values presented are lower than the sediment intensity values given above. However, we recognise that low sediment concentrations may be useful for the identification of risks.

2.4 Sediment influence maps and analysis for 50% waste capture.

Modelled particles in a sea area can be analysed for each modelled grid cell and presented to show the potential influence of discharged sediment on the surrounding sea area.

2.4.1 Sediment influence maps

Figure 4 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month (time average) for the proposed site only, assuming no waste capture occurs. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2).

Values less than $1 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ have been excluded from the map and subsequent calculations. These low concentration cells are produced by the particle tracking approach but they are not considered to be representative of the main influence of a discharge.

The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure. Cells which are shaded black are similar to the average intensity in the total area of influence shown in the map. Cells shaded pink are similar to the median (middle value in the range) intensity value shown on the map. White shaded cells are similar to the minimum intensity value shown on the map.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $501.87 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $297.7 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- Cells influenced by the proposed site do not appear to lie close to existing farm sites.

Figure 5 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site and other relevant sites. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2). The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure and is in a similar format as that shown in Figure 4. The average sediment intensity, after including all relevant sites, is increased.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $328.23 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $172.50 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- Cells influenced by existing sites do not appear to lie close to the proposed site.

2.4.2 Sediment influence analysis

Model grid cells can be analysed to estimate the size and concentration of the potential sediment influence from the modelled sites.

- The total area of sediment influenced by the three sites modelled is estimated to be 0.10 square kilometres (km^2).
- As shown in Figure 5, the average and median intensity over this area are $328.23 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $172.50 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- The total weight of fish that generates this modelled influence is 4500 tonnes.

Table 2 shows the information for each individual site modelled. It is important to note that the total area of influence for all sites is not the sum of the numbers in Table 2. The total area of influence worked out above takes into account that the individual areas of influence from different sites will overlap.

Table 2: Sediment influence information for each site, where 50% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).

Site Name	Average Intensity (g/m ²)	Area of Influence (km ²)	Median Intensity (g/m ²)	Max weight Of Fish (tonnes)
BNRT1	501.87	0.05	297.7	4000 (with 50% waste capture)
FFMC76	137.74	0.05	163.14	500

There are no Environmental Standards for sediment intensity. However, we consider that:

- underneath farm pens, an intensity of 2000 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed ecological outcome
- at the edge of the mixing zone, an intensity of 250 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed mixing zone outcome

The estimate of influence detailed above is indicative. The values presented are lower than the sediment intensity values given above. However, we recognise that low sediment concentrations may be useful for the identification of risks.

2.5 Sediment influence maps and analysis for 90% waste capture.

Modelled particles in a sea area can be analysed for each modelled grid cell and presented to show the potential influence of discharged sediment on the surrounding sea area.

2.5.1 Sediment influence maps

Figure 6 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month (time average) for the proposed site only, assuming no waste capture occurs. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2).

Values less than $1 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ have been excluded from the map and subsequent calculations. These low concentration cells are produced by the particle tracking approach but they are not considered to be representative of the main influence of a discharge.

The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure. Cells which are shaded black are similar to the average intensity in the total area of influence shown in the map. Cells shaded pink are similar to the median (middle value in the range) intensity value shown on the map. White shaded cells are similar to the minimum intensity value shown on the map.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $100.37 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $59.54 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.
- Cells influenced by the proposed site do not appear to lie close to existing farm sites.

Figure 7 shows a map of the modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site and other relevant sites. Grid cells within the model that are influenced by modelled sediment are shaded according to the intensity of the influence in grams per square metre (g/m^2). The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure and is in a similar format as that shown in Figure 6. The average sediment intensity, after including all relevant sites, is increased.

- The average and median sediment intensity over the area of influence is $118.19 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $84.58 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.

Cells influenced by existing sites do not appear to lie close to the proposed site.

2.5.2 Sediment influence analysis

Model grid cells can be analysed to estimate the size and concentration of the potential sediment influence from the modelled sites.

- The total area of sediment influenced by the three sites modelled is estimated to be 0.10 square kilometres (km^2).
- As shown in Figure 5, the average and median intensity over this area are $118.19 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ and $84.58 \text{ g}/\text{m}^2$ respectively.

- The total weight of fish that generates this modelled influence is 4500 tonnes.

Table 3 shows the information for each individual site modelled. It is important to note that the total area of influence for all sites is not the sum of the numbers in Table 3. The total area of influence worked out above takes into account that the individual areas of influence from different sites will overlap.

Table 3: Sediment influence information for each site, where 90% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).

Site Name	Average Intensity (g/m ²)	Area of Influence (km ²)	Median Intensity (g/m ²)	Max weight Of Fish (tonnes)
BNRT1	100.37	0.05	59.54	4000 (with 90% waste capture)
FFMC76	137.74	0.05	163.14	500

There are no Environmental Standards for sediment intensity. However, we consider that:

- underneath farm pens, an intensity of 2000 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed ecological outcome
- at the edge of the mixing zone, an intensity of 250 g/m² or less is likely to lead to an acceptable sea bed mixing zone outcome

The estimate of influence detailed above is indicative. The values presented are lower than the sediment intensity values given above. However, we recognise that low sediment concentrations may be useful for the identification of risks.

2.6 Bath medicine influence maps and analysis for 0% waste capture (i.e. a standard farm).

Modelled particles in a sea area can be analysed for each modelled grid cell and presented to show the potential influence of discharged bath medicine on the surrounding sea area. Results presented are for the AZA medicine (see section 1.2.3). Whilst no bath medicines have been applied for at Beinn Reithe (BNRT1), we wish to examine the potential influence of nutrient releases. Therefore AZA medicine has been modelled at screening to act as a proxy (see section 1.2.4), helping to demonstrate the potential extent and relative concentrations, rather than actual concentrations of nutrient influences. For this reason screening modelling has been done assuming 0% waste capture (i.e. worst case discharge extent).

2.6.1 Bath medicine influence maps

Figure 6 shows a map of the modelled average AZA concentration over four days for the proposed site only. Grid cells within the model which experience an AZA influence are shaded according to the concentration of AZA in nanograms per litre (ng/l).

Values less than 10 ng/l have been excluded from the map and subsequent calculations. These low concentration cells are produced by the particle tracking approach but they are not considered to be representative of the main influence of a discharge.

Please note that the Environmental Standard for Azamethiphos with the lowest concentration is 40 ng/l. This must be met 72 hours after the material has been discharged. The estimate of influence detailed here is precautionary. In the information presented below areas of influence above 40 ng/l have been quoted. However the average and median concentrations are quoted for the entire area of influence above 10 ng/l.

The shading key is shown in the top left of the figure. Cells which are shaded black are similar to the average concentration in the total area of influence shown in the map. Cells shaded pink are similar to the median (middle value in the range) concentration shown on the map. White shaded cells are similar to the minimum concentration value shown on the map.

- The average and median concentration over the total area of influence is 27.14 ng/l and 17.13 ng/l respectively.
- A small number of cells influenced by the proposed site appear to lie close Loch Long (FFMC76), however concentrations are relatively low.

Figure 7 shows a map of the modelled average AZA influence over four days for the proposed site and other relevant sites. The average AZA influence, after including all relevant sites, is not increased.

- The average and median AZA concentration over the total area of influence is 27.14 ng/l and 17.13ng/l respectively.
- There are no cells influenced by other modelled sites within the model domain area.

2.6.2 Bath medicine influence analysis

Model grid cells can be analysed to estimate the size and concentration of the potential AZA influence from the modelled sites.

- The area of AZA influence above 40 ng/l from all sites modelled is estimated to be 0.30 square kilometres (km²).
- As shown in Figure 7, the average and median concentration over the total area of influence is 27.14 and 17.13 ng/l respectively.
- The total weight of fish that generates this modelled influence is 4500 tonnes.

Table 4 shows the information for each individual site modelled. It is important to note that the total area of influence above 40 ng/l for all sites quoted above is not the sum of the numbers in Table 4. The total area of influence worked out above takes into account that the individual areas of influence above 40 ng/l from different sites will overlap.

Table 4: Azamethiphos influence information for each site, where 0% of waste is captured at the proposed site (BNRT1).

Site Name	Average Conc. (ng/l)	Area of Influence Above 40 ng/l (km ²)	Median Conc. (ng/l)	Weight Of Fish (tonnes)
BNRT1	27.14	0.30	17.13	4000 (with 90% waste capture)
FFMC76	0	0	0	500

Please note that the Environmental Standard for Azamethiphos with the lowest concentration is 40 ng/l. This must be met 72 hours after the material has been discharged. The estimate of influence detailed above is precautionary. The values presented are close to the 40 ng/l standard. Detailed modelling will be required to demonstrate compliance with all Environmental Standards.




Figure 2: Modelled average water speed (metres per second – m/s) in the sea area surrounding the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).




Figure 3: Modelled percentage of time the water flow speed is above 0.095 m/s in the sea area surrounding the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).




Figure 4: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm).




Figure 5: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 0% waste capture (i.e. standard farm) and other relevant sites.




Figure 6: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 50% waste capture.




Figure 7: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 50% waste capture and other relevant sites.




Figure 8: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 90% waste capture.




Figure 9: Modelled average sediment intensity over one month for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)), assuming 90% waste capture and other relevant sites.




Figure 10: Modelled average Azamethiphos concentration over four days from neap tide release for the proposed site only (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).




Figure 11: Modelled average Azamethiphos concentration over four days from neap tide release for the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)) and other relevant sites.

3 Risk identification

The screening modelling output summarised in section 2 is compared against available information on features of interest (see section 1.1.2). Features which require attention are presented with any additional comments. Identified features will need to be considered during the pre-application phase.

These should be addressed in the applicant "Method Statement". Please refer to the Modelling Method Statement section on the SEPA Website.

(<https://www.sepa.org.uk/regulations/water/aquaculture/pre-application/>)

3.1 Identified features which require attention

3.1.1 Table of identified features

Based on screening output the following features of interest have been identified.

Table 5: Table of identified features

No.	Feature Name	Feature Type	Location (Easting, Northing)	Brief Reason For Identification
1	Loch Long	Shellfish Water Protected Area	(Figure 10.)	At risk from sediment influence.



Figure 12. Shapefiles of identified features around the proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)).

3.2 Additional comments on identified features

Screening modelling demonstrates sediment discharges from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) may influence the Shellfish Protected Area in the upper sections of Loch Long. Although levels of risk associated with this site are difficult to predict without CFD modelling demonstrating realistic levels of waste capture at this site, higher resolution marine modelling will likely be required to ensure risks to shellfish are low. Whilst known PMFs within this area have been considered, screening modelling does not predict any significant sediment influence to these from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1), nor does it predict interactions between farms, as material is expected to remain within a small area close to the farm.

3.3 Risks identified due to novel semi enclosed farm

Given this application is for a novel semi – enclosed farm, screening modelling has been done for 0% waste capture, to help identify the level of risk under a worst case scenario. Whilst the aim of reducing the environmental impact by developing semi-enclosed farms is appreciated, implications of the novel approach not meeting expectations should be considered. Screening modelling at 0% waste capture demonstrates very high levels of sediment would be deposited over a small area. Had this application been for a standard farm, it is very unlikely that it would be able to meet the current regulatory framework

standards, as the flow conditions are clearly unable to support the biomass. Therefore, in order to ensure structural/engineering failures do not result in a substantial risk to the environment, this proposal needs to demonstrate that the likelihood of significant failures have been assessed, and that plans for appropriate measures to mitigate the environmental risk should failure occur, have been developed.

In addition to the sediment material released directly from the pens, the waste captured material will be processed at a dewatering plant (nearby barge or shore base), and then returned to the loch. It is expected this will remove approx. 95% of the solids, releasing only the smaller sediments. This outlet pipe will need to be assessed using initial dilution calculations, as consistent with point source applications, but should also be included in any marine modelling of this site.

Sea lice are not considered to be an issue in this proposal as the influx water pipe is expected to be below the sea lice zone. This is based on evidence from similar systems used in Norway. Considering this is an application for a very large farm, with no sea lice medicines applied for, a short description of processes which can be put in place to deal with an unexpected sea lice infestation will be required.

3.4 Potential risks due to increased nutrient release

Available oceanographic measurements from Loch Long indicate that tidal currents in the area are low. The loch also experiences heat and freshwater stratification, where less dense water near the surface can influence water flow and mixing. Low tidal currents and stratification often inhibit the mixing of soluble material in a water area. The low level of mixing is illustrated in Figure 10, where a simulation of a bath medicine discharge shows material still being resident in vicinity of the farm four days after release. Whilst medicines are not proposed to be used at this site, the screening output suggests that other dissolved material released from the farm, such as nutrients, is unlikely to be mixed quickly through the surrounding water. A build-up of nutrients, under specific conditions, in a water area can influence plankton growth. This may, in turn, lead to a deterioration in water quality.

As outlined on our website, guidelines, prepared by Marine Scotland, can be used to assess the likelihood of nutrient risks to the marine environment. The applicant has used the most recent guidance available [3] and [4] to conduct an assessment of potential nutrient impacts by calculating the potential change to the “nutrient enhancement index” (NEI) arising from proposed new farm. The most recent assessment available in [3] identifies that Loch Long (inc. Loch Goil) currently has a NEI enhancement of 1. The addition of the proposed farm is not predicted to alter the current status of the NEI.

The “hydrographic assumptions” which underpin the assessment of the NEI are simplified. The so called “tidal prism” method is known to “overestimate the exchange of water and therefore underpredict the flushing time” [4]. Whilst the calculated NEI for the larger Loch Long/Loch Goil system may be low, the proposed farm is located in a relatively shallow basin in upper Loch Long, behind a “sill” (a small shallow area of a sea loch). Given the simplified nature of the calculation of the flushing time used in [4] we feel that a more robust assessment of the flushing characteristics of the Loch Long system is required to address any potential influence on water quality and how this may be reduced.

We recommend that a 2D marine model is used to derive a more accurate flushing time for Loch Long which can be used with the NEI calculation.

Additionally, modelling should be carried out to provide a conservative estimate of the likely nutrient concentrations in the upper basin of Loch Long. Particular focus should be given to the assessment of two key sources of nutrients from the farm:

1. Nutrients entering the Loch from the exchange of water with the farm pens.
2. Nutrients entering the Loch from a marine outfall linked to the processing of solid waste collected from the farm.

It will be important to identify, and model correctly, the release location and depth of any sources. Estimates of initial dilution of nutrients at the marine outfall will also be required.

The assessment of nutrient concentrations in upper Loch Long should include other major sources such as those from Arrochar Sewage Treatment Works (STW), the Loin Water and Croe Water. The approach to modelling these sources will be agreed in the Modelling Method Statement for the application.

4 Conclusion of screening modelling and risk identification

Following screening modelling and risk identification we make a number of conclusions and recommendations.

4.1 Conclusions

4.1.1 Screening Modelling

- The proposed site (Beinn Reithe (BNRT1)) is in an area of low dispersion and has a low capacity for erosion of material on the sea bed.
- From sediment and bath treatment modelling:
 - Information presented in section 2.2 indicates that if the application had been for a standard site (with 0% waste capture), at this location, the flow dynamics of the area are unsuitable for the proposed tonnage and the proposed site would be very unlikely to meet the current regulatory framework standards.
 - However, as this is a semi enclosed site, aiming to capture the majority of its waste, sections 2.3 and 2.4 suggests this site is likely to have low – moderate impact on the seabed. CFD modelling estimating the likely levels of waste capture are required to help ensure levels of influence are low, and the output from section 2.4 (90% waste capture), is a more realistic scenario.
 - All screening modelling shows the sediment influence on the surrounding sea area from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) is likely to be low.
 - All screening modelling shows the areas of sediment influence from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) and other sites modelled do not appear to interact.
 - No medicines from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) have been applied for as this is a semi enclosed site. Therefore screening modelling of bath medicines is not applicable. However, these model outputs have been used to assess the potential influence of nutrients.
 - Assuming waste capture is between 50 and 90%, Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) is likely to result in a moderate increase in the total influence of all sites modelled. This is separate from areas of influence generated by existing sites.
- Due to the low dispersion nature of the waters surrounding the site, nutrient discharges from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) are likely to have an influence on the surrounding sea area. Marine modelling to provide assessment of nutrient influence will be required.

4.1.2 Risk Identification

The modelled influence from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1) is expected to be low to moderate depending on the percentage of waste the semi enclosed system can capture. CFD modelling will need to be undertaken to demonstrate this percentage. However, the risk to the Shellfish Protected Area (outlined in section 3) in which this farm is located, will need to be addressed with more detailed marine modelling, in order to demonstrate that the influence on this feature is low.

All other actions outlined in sections 3.3 and 3.4, relating to concerns associated with this novel semi – enclosed farm, will need to be addressed.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Site suitability

Consideration of screening modelling and risk identification suggests that it is possible that discharges from the proposed site will be able to comply with the relevant aspects of the SEPA Aquaculture Regulatory Framework. This must be demonstrated with a detailed marine model. Nutrient issues identified in this report are particularly important to assess. This screening report will be updated based on the results from CFD modelling of waste capture, to provide a revised determination of risk level.

It is also possible that the site will be able to comply with our mixing zone regulatory framework, however this is highly dependent on the percentage of waste captured. From initial NewDepomod testing it appears waste capture of at least 90% would be required to allow the proposed biomass to comply with framework standards. This will need to be demonstrated using the NewDepomod model. As no calibration data is available, default NewDepomod settings will need to be used.

As this is a novel system, a CFD method statement should first be submitted. Once assessed by SEPA, CFD modelling can be undertaken, and following this, the screening report will be updated. This will allow a more informed screening report to be scrutinised at the engagement meeting(s).

Following the engagement meeting(s), this report will be revised again, which should allow the applicant to submit a method statement which address the issues raised in this document.

4.2.2 Further modelling

- CFD modelling will be required to determine the percentage of waste captured from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1).
- Due to the identified risks, 2D marine modelling should be carried out. Models used must fully calibrated/validated using appropriate field data.
- The marine model should include discharges from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1), Loch Long (FFMC76) and the point source outfall from Beinn Reithe (BNRT1).
- The resolution of the marine model should be relatively fine around the proposed site and identified features at risk.
- Nutrient modelling of this site and all other significant nutrient inputs into the head of Loch Long will also be required.

5 References

- [1] *Regulatory Modelling Guidance For The Aquaculture Sector. Published on SEPA website.*
- [2] *<http://marine.gov.scot/information/wider-domain-scottish-shelf-model>.*
- [3] *Marine Scotland Science. Locational Guidelines for the Authorisation of Marine Fish Farms in Scottish Water. January 2015. Published online.*
- [4] *Scottish Fisheries Research Report Number 63 / 2002. SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE LOCATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR FISH FARMING: PREDICTED LEVELS OF NUTRIENT ENHANCEMENT AND BENTHIC IMPACT. Published Online.*