1.0 Introductions
CC opened the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

2.0 Changes to the DGSR project
SJ introduced the changes to the project.
CB explained the background to the DGSR project, the Strategic Wider Works (SWW) process, and ongoing liaison with National Grid as system operator and Ofgem. Cost benefit analysis showed the full DGSR scheme is not required at present, but there is a need for a reduced reinforcement scheme from Kendoon to Tongland to ensure continued security of supply and incremental capacity increase. The reduced scheme does not qualify as SWW so the SWW process is now concluded and the reduced scheme can proceed on its own merits.

CB outlined the reduced scheme, to be known as the Kendoon-Tongland Reinforcement (KTR) project, explaining that new 132kV overhead lines would be required running north to Kendoon and south to Tongland from Glenlee substation, which could be extended to avoid the need for a new substation.

CB said the reinforcement would allow generators to connect to the network, but the additional capacity would be limited and operational and commercial solutions would be required to constrain generation in some situations. SPEN was working with Ofgem and National Grid to discuss possible derogations to allow operation of the network in this way.

In response to a question from DS, CB explained that under the reduced (KTR) scheme, power would flow south-north or north-south, whereas under the full DGSR scheme it would have flowed west-east or east-west, and bottlenecks further north on the network would constrain system capacity.

3.0 Update on Kendoon to Tongland Reinforcement Project
CB explained the technical requirements of the KTR project. SJ explained how following feedback from the Phase 1 public consultation in 2015, the Glenlee to Tongland preferred route corridor (known as Zone 3 corridor in the DGSR project) had now been extended to the west to allow a wider search area for potential route options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>Review of the role and Terms of Reference for the group in relation to the KTR project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>explained that the change in project scope meant the SSLG should now proceed without the members from England and South Ayrshire Council as they were no longer affected by the project. CC said the group’s remit would remain to ensure an open and constructive approach to identifying, reporting and considering issues that could have an impact on Scottish Government decisions relating to the project. She said it should be a forum for addressing cross-cutting issues and in developing good information flows to help prevent or minimise delays in considering issues. CC said that Scottish Ministers recognise the importance of engaging communities impacted by the project and are keen to set up a Community Liaison Group (CLG), chaired by the Scottish Government, to interact with them. CC said the SSLG would remain separate as a forum for the statutory bodies. CC said Scottish Government and SPEN would contact Dumfries and Galloway Council community liaison team to discuss the construction and representation of the CLG and would report back to SSLG on progress. JM, AC, NG and DS all welcomed the principle of establishing a CLG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC/SJ</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>Routeing methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KW</td>
<td>explained the evolution of the methodology following the first round of consultation and that SPEN will now be looking at a much more focused geographic area based around the proposed corridor for identification and appraisal of potential route options for the KTR project. No new substations are now required. In line with Holford Rules, SPEN will seek to keep lines as far from residential properties as possible, while taking account of constraints such as landscape, wildlife (including birds), tourism, peat, archaeology, , land use (i.e. committed development) and flood risk. KW described the desk based landscape-led process to identify potential route options, followed by field work to identify particular local constraints, which has also been informed by local information provided by respondents to last year’s consultation, and review the desk based options. The route options are then subject to an environmental appraisal culminating in the selection of ‘preferred routes’ for each section of the project. These preferred route options, together with the alternative options considered, will be the focus of the proposed consultation in the Autumn of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Feedback by 05 August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.0 | **Consultation strategy**  
SJ introduced the draft consultation strategy document for discussion, and asked SSLG members to provide feedback by Friday 19 August. 
CC asked how SPEN planned to involve people living in the proposed Zone 3 corridor extension who were not included in the first round of consultation, because at that stage they were outside the consultation zone. 
RH said the phase 1 consultation zones extended 1km beyond the preferred corridors, so many people in the extended corridor area were contacted then. The number of people not previously contacted and within the extended area was likely to be very small, but all within 1km of the revised corridors would be contacted in the second round of consultation. He added that the Zone 4 corridor had been extended to the west following feedback from local people in the first round of consultation. 
SJ said SPEN was planning to hold the second round of consultation in autumn 2016. There would be two zones: Kendoon-Glenlee and Glenlee-Tongland. Drop-in events would be in Kirkcudbright, New Galloway and Mossdale. He asked the SSLG if they favoured an event in Dumfries too, given the reduced scheme no longer came near to Dumfries. 
CC felt there should be an event in Dumfries for the wider community so SPEN could explain the reduced scheme and people could come to ask any questions. 
CB noted that there may still be a need for further reinforcement beyond the KTR scheme in future.  
**| | **All**  
**|  | Feedback by 019 August 2016** |
| 7.0 | **Next steps**  
SJ outlined the probable project programme to 2023, including a further round of Pre Application Consultation in 2017 and submission of Section 37 consent applications for the project to the Scottish Government in 2018. He said preferred routes for the KTR project would be introduced at the next SSLG meeting.  
**| | **SJ/RH**  
**|  | Ongoing** |
| 8.0 | **Next meeting**  
The suggested date for the next SSLG meeting is Thursday 8th September.  
**| | **SPEN**  
**|  | Ongoing** |