

DUMFRIES & GALLOWAY STRATEGIC REINFORCEMENT – STAKEHOLDER LIAISON GROUP MEETING MINUTES		
Date	13 <sup>th</sup> March 2015	
Time	1030-1330hrs	
Venue	Station Hotel, Dumfries	
Attendees:		
<b>Name</b>		
Cathy Cacace (CC) – Scottish Government	David McNay (DM) - SEPA	Diyar Kadar (DK) - SPEN
Frances Pacitti (FP) – Scottish Government	Ruth Cameron (RC) – Historic Scotland	Colin Brown (CB) - SPEN
Stuart Graham (SG) - SNH	Lorna MacLean (LM) - SEPA	Cathie Hill (CH) - SPEN
John Malcolm (JM) – Historic Scotland	Ross Baxter (RB) - SPEN	Guy Kenyon (GK) – Cumbria CC
David Suttie (DS) – Dumfries & Galloway	Stephen Jack (SJ) - SPEN	Phillip Cartter (PC) – Environment Agency
Ian Steele (IS) - SPEN	Joanna Wright (JW) - LUC	James Baird (JB) – LUC
Marc Van Grieken (MVG) - MVGLA	Ross Hayman (RH) - Copper	
Circulation:		
<b>Name</b>		
Cathy Cacace (SGECU)	Frances Pacitti (SGECU)	David Suttie (DGC)
Robert Duncan (DGC)	John Esslemont (SAC)	Stuart Graham (SNH)
John Malcolm (HS)	Ruth Cameron (HS)	David McNay (SEPA)
Lorna MacLean (SEPA)	Guy Kenyon (CCC)	Graham Hale (CCC)
Chris Hardman (CC)	Hannah Booth (EN)	Andrew Davison (EH)
Phillip Carter (EA)	Stephen Jack (SPEN)	Ross Baxter (SPEN)
Colin Brown (SPEN)	Iain Steele (SPEN)	Cathie Hill (SPEN)
Diyar Kadar (SPEN)	Joanna Wright (LUC)	James Baird (LUC)
Marc Van Grieken (MVGLA)	Ross Hayman (Copper)	Kate Wigley (LUC)

	Description	Owner	Status
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Note of Attendance and Introductions</b>		
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Introduction by Chair/ Terms of Reference/Membership</b>		
<b>2.1</b>	<b>CC</b> confirmed that The Scottish Government Energy Consents Unit (SGECU) will act as Chair for the Stakeholder Group going forward.	<b>CC</b>	Complete
<b>2.2</b>	<b>CC</b> stressed that the role of the Group is not to gain support for every issue to be discussed as a means to an eventual “rubber stamp” for the project but rather a platform to foster an open and constructive approach to identifying, reporting and considering issues that will have an impact on that decision.	<b>ALL</b>	Complete
<b>2.3</b>	<b>SJ</b> highlighted that the frequency of the Group’s meetings would be determined by the stage of the project and issues to be discussed at that time. This being the case it is expected that frequency will vary from monthly to bimonthly or quarterly meetings.	<b>ALL</b>	Ongoing
<b>2.4</b>	The terms of reference were accepted by all	<b>ALL</b>	Complete
<b>2.5</b>	<b>SJ</b> raised the point that, whilst the Group will discuss high level issues, there will remain a requirement to hold separate meetings/workshops regarding specific technical matters outside of this.	<b>ALL</b>	Ongoing
<b>2.6</b>	<b>DM</b> raised point regarding membership of the Group for other stakeholders such as Forestry Commission Scotland. It was confirmed that other members would be considered throughout the lifetime of the project and invited to attend where required however this would be limited to those stakeholders who have a decision making role.	<b>ALL</b>	Ongoing
<b>2.7</b>	<b>RB</b> asked the Group whether they felt they would benefit from a wider share point site, as opposed to a group email, meaning that all members would receive detail on matters which did not concern them. Members seemed receptive to this idea and requested that	<b>SJ</b>	Ongoing

	SPEN put such a system in place for future correspondence. <b>SJ</b> to investigate this and report back at next Group meeting.		
<b>3.0</b>	<b>The Project</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	<b>GK</b> asked for clarification on the meaning of “supergrid” infrastructure. <b>DK</b> confirmed that the term is used in reference to infrastructure operating at 275kV and 400kV. SPEN will ensure that this is made clear in future presentations, consultation materials etc	<b>SJ</b>	Ongoing
<b>4.0</b>	<b>The Engineering Solution</b>		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>HB</b> asked if SPEN had undertaken, or intend to undertake, public consultation on the alternative engineering options presented. <b>SJ</b> confirmed that neither system optioneering nor onshore engineering options had been consulted on. Whilst it is not intended to consult publically on these options, SPEN need to ensure that the decision making process leading to the establishment of an onshore (overhead option) is articulated in a clear and concise manner through the consultation process.	<b>SJ</b>	Ongoing
<b>4.2</b>	<b>SG</b> asked whether the additional network capacity created by the proposal would be sufficient to accommodate all future demand in the area. <b>DK</b> explained that, whilst it is difficult to predict what generation levels in the area will be like in the long term, significant work has been and will be carried out to model future generation scenarios and consult with existing and future system users in order to inform both the system optioneering and onshore engineering options. <b>DK</b> stated that the proposed engineering solution has been developed to enable both the scaling up and scaling down of investment to align with the generation sensitivity analysis.	<b>DK</b>	Complete
	<b>Broad Corridor Routeing Methodology</b>		
<b>5.1</b>	<b>HB</b> asked if the existing Tongland to Dumfries 132kV overhead line was visible from the Solway Firth. <b>MVG</b> replied that parts of the line might be visible		
<b>5.2</b>	<b>DM</b> asked if forestry management plans had been taken into consideration when identifying and appraising corridor options. <b>SJ</b> noted that this would be considered at the detailed routeing stage but had not influenced broad corridor options.		
<b>5.3</b>	<b>SJ</b> intimated that SPEN/LUC are keen to obtain feedback on the adopted corridor routeing methodology from Group members. Paper copies of the corridor routeing methodology were made available for all members to take away at the end of the meeting. Several group members also requested an electronic version of the methodology. PDF copies of the methodology will be circulated with the meeting minutes.	<b>SJ</b>	Complete
<b>5.4</b>	<b>SJ</b> noted potential interaction with National Grid’s (NGET) North West Coast Connection (NWCC) project at Harker. <b>SJ</b> confirmed that SPEN have an interface with NGET and will work with them throughout the development of the project to ensure such things as cumulative effects of wirescape, and phase construction activity with NGET are coordinated to minimise impacts.		
<b>5.5</b>	<b>SJ</b> intimated that SPEN would like any comments on the routeing methodology by Friday 17 <sup>th</sup> April.	<b>ALL</b>	Ongoing
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>		
<b>6.1</b>	<b>DS</b> raised the point that the project was likely to receive significant levels of opposition from people/groups that are not directly affected by the project given one of the drivers is to provide additional capacity for onshore renewables.		
<b>6.1</b>	<b>SJ</b> intimated that SPEN would like any comments on the proposed method of stakeholder engagement by Friday 10 <sup>th</sup> April.	<b>ALL</b>	Ongoing
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Project Programme</b>		
<b>7.1</b>	<b>HB</b> noted that the proposed public consultation on the broad corridor options may overlap with the planned NWCC and Moorside		

	consultations.		
<b>7.2</b>	<b>SJ</b> intimated that the overall project programme, beyond planned submission of scoping request in June 2016, was under review and made the commitment to keep the Group updated on this over the coming months.	<b>SJ</b>	Ongoing
	<b>Date for Next Meeting</b>		
	<b>Proposed next meeting date is Wednesday 29<sup>th</sup> April 2015</b>		