

DUMFRIES & GALLOWAY STRATEGIC REINFORCEMENT – STATUTORY STAKEHOLDER LIAISON GROUP MEETING MINUTES		
Date	28 th October 2015	
Time	1300-1600hrs	
Venue	Station Hotel, Dumfries	
Attendees:		
Name		
Cathy Cacace (CC) – Scottish Government (Chair)	Ross Hayman (RH) - Copper	Jeremy Pickup – Env Agency
James McKenzie – Scottish Government	Ruth Cameron (RC) – Historic Environment Scotland	Colin Brown (CB) - SPEN
Nick Gedge - SNH	John Esslemont – South Ayrshire Council	Chloe Porter – HES
John Gorman - SEPA	Mike Shepherd (MS) – SNH	Leanne Beverley – Cumbria CC
Robert Duncan (RD) – Dumfries & Galloway Council	Stephen Jack (SJ) - SPEN	John Dougan (JD) – Forestry Commission
Ian Steele (IS) - SPEN	Kate Wigley (LUC)	
Marc Van Grieken (MVG) - MVGLA	David McNay – SEPA	
Circulation:		
Name		
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)	Kate Berry (NE)
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)
	Kathryn Dunne (PINS)	Andrew Davison (EH)

	Description	Owner	Status
1.0	CC opened the meeting and asked attendees to introduce themselves.		
2.0	Minutes from the previous meeting were agreed. SJ apologised that because of technical issues it had not yet been possible to set up a secure shared area within the project website for SLG members, and asked the meeting if they would still find this useful. There was a consensus in favour and SJ agreed to continue to pursue the idea. CC explained that Nicki Anderson was no longer the Scottish Government's project officer, following a promotion, and that a new project officer would be appointed and announced in due course.	SJ CC	Ongoing Ongoing
3.0	Phase 1 consultation and feedback		
3.1	CC began by noting that SPEN had extended the public consultation period from the end of 24 July 2015 to the end of August 2015, and that this had been welcomed by the Scottish Government. SJ talked through the Phase 1 consultation process, the key themes arising from feedback (both overall and in each of the consultation zones along the preferred corridor and substation siting areas), and how SPEN was taking issues into account in particular locations. He explained that following discussion at the previous SLG meeting, the consultation zones had been widened in some areas to ensure whole communities were included, rather than just the proportions of them within 1km of the preferred corridor or substation siting area. He also said the project team had made project information available at relevant Dumfries and		

	<p>Galloway Council customer service points as well as libraries, following a suggestion from the council.</p> <p>SJ said that the extension to the consultation period had had a knock-on effect on programme, and that the feedback report would not now be published until the turn of the year.</p> <p>CC said she understood the reasons for this but would like SPEN to issue some form of interim update, as stakeholders and public had been expecting the report before the end of 2015. SJ agreed that SPEN will provide this update.</p>	SJ	Ongoing
4.0	Routeing and siting methodology		
4.1	<p>KW explained that consultation feedback received in relation to corridor routeing and substation siting was currently being used to review and 'test' the preferred corridors and siting areas including the alternative options considered in the Routeing and Consultation document. This review has also been informed by meetings with local interest groups and community councils. Corridor amendments were currently being considered in some locations and this would be reported on within the feedback report</p> <p>KW explained that the team was currently reviewing the detailed routeing and siting methodology following the consultation, to check the correct weightings were being applied to different factors such as locally significant environmental areas and people. It was proposed that a further meeting of the SLG would be held before the end of the year in order to discuss and agree with group members.</p>		
5.0	Programme		
5.1	<p>SJ explained that as the potential corridor extensions (see 4.1) went beyond the Phase 1 consultation zones, SPEN are considering how best to involve people in these areas as the project develops.</p> <p>CC said it was very interesting how much work had been done and how it was being taken forward. She asked how people in the widened areas would be informed, and RH outlined a possible process.</p> <p>JD said SPEN would need to be clear why the search area had been expanded in some areas and not others.</p> <p>MVG said the routeing methodology would make this clear. He said previous corridors had been properly identified and tested, but during the consultation some people had said they would be less worried about an overhead line route on higher ground if it was further away from or behind their properties, and therefore it was right to review the routeing methodology to assess the weighting given to both environmental and people factors.</p> <p>JD asked whether such a review could lead to changes in other areas along the corridors.</p> <p>SJ said these were the only areas where specific alternative routes were suggested however, as the process is iterative, this did not rule out going back to consider corridor routeing where potential/suggested route alignments take the routeing outside of a corridor. KW said the main reason they were not considered in the first place was topography, which is a relative factor. They avoided designated areas but were slightly higher in altitude.</p> <p>MS asked if the routeing methodology would explain where undergrounding might be considered, and SJ said that the process for the consideration of undergrounding is set out in Chapter 6 of SPEN's 'Approach to Routeing Electrical Infrastructure' document.</p>		
6.0	Any other business		
6.1	SJ suggested another SLG meeting should take place this year to	SJ	Ongoing

	<p>discuss routeing methodology and any proposed changes to it, and would look for a date in early December. CC asked for the documentation to be circulated a week beforehand.</p> <p>RD said Dumfries and Galloway councillors should also be briefed on the consultation feedback report and next steps, and CC suggested this should also include MSPs and MPs. SJ explained that this was the approach adopted prior to first round of consultation earlier this year and confirmed that it is SPEN's intention to continue to engage with elected members as the project progresses.</p> <p>RD asked when more information would be available on how the need case and strategic optioneering was being defined, and the methodology for taking certain strategic options to detailed cost-benefit analysis and not others. CB explained how SPEN was using specialists to analyse the contracted position, the scale and type of generation likely to emerge in future, and how external pressures (such as DECC changes to subsidies) might affect future capacity requirements. SJ explained that SPEN see the need for a public facing document, which would expand on the 'Need Case Summary' document published as part of the consultation material, to further explain which strategic options had been considered and how these had been assessed with regards to technical, economic and environmental matters.</p>	<p>SJ</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
--	--	------------------	----------------