

09

Appendices

Appendix 9.1

Water

Framework

Directive

Screening and

Scoping

Assessment

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Study Area	1
1.3 Introduction to the Water Framework Directive	2
1.4 Assessment Process.....	3
1.5 Desk Study	3
1.6 Assumptions and Limitations	3
2. WFD Screening	5
2.1 WFD Screening Overview	5
The screening stage also identifies specific activities of the Propose that could affect receptor water bodies' WFD status, and which should be carried forward to subsequent stages of the assessment process. Justification is provided where water body receptors are screened out and are not carried forward through the assessment.....	
Screening of WFD Water Bodies	5
2.2 Screening of Activities.....	7
2.3 Screening of Sensitive Sites.....	10
2.4 Summary of Screening Assessment.....	10
3. WFD Scoping	10
3.1 Overview	10
3.2 Scoping of Upper Forth Estuary	11
3.3 Alloa WFD Groundwater Body	17
4. Conclusion	18

Tables

Table 1 WFD summary for the Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body	5
Table 2 WFD summary for the Alloa groundwater body	6
Table 3 Screening of Activities	7
Table 4 Assessment of hydromorphology risk from activity	11
Table 5 Assessment of water quality risks	13
Table 6 Scoping assessment of risks to biological marine habitats and fish	14
Table 7 Scoping assessment of risks to WFD protected areas	16
Table 8 Scoping assessment for Alloa Groundwater Body	17

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

This Water Framework Directive (WFD) Screening and Scoping Assessment has been completed as an appendix to **Chapter 9: Water Environment and Flood Risk** of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report for the Proposed Development.

The Proposed Development accompanies an application to construct the Kincardine North Substation (KINN), located centrally within the EIA Boundary at approx. NS 92604 89371. As part of these works, underground cables will be laid to the south of the site connecting to the existing Kincardine Substation. It will also entail the upgrading of three existing overhead lines as part of planned reinforcements of the existing transmission system in central Scotland. The three existing lines are described as follows:

- Approximately 10 km of an existing overhead line (known as 'XL route') from southwest of Blairingone in Perth and Kinross to a new substation, to be known as Kincardine North, at Kilbagie in Fife. XL route then continues to the existing Kincardine Substation located to the immediate north of the River Forth. This forms part of a wider upgrade referred to as ECUP. The Proposed XL Upgrade comprises an increase in the operating voltage of the overhead line from 275 to 400 kilovolts (kV) increasing its capacity as well as construction of four new towers to turn in and connect XL route to the proposed Kincardine North Substation.
- Approximately 22 km of an existing overhead line (known as 'ZCN route') from Longannet to the proposed Kincardine North Substation. The ZCN route then continues to the existing Denny North Substation located approximately 1.5 km north of Denny. This forms part of a wider upgrade referred to as LWUP. The Proposed ZCN Upgrade comprises new terminal towers to turn in and connect both routes to the proposed Kincardine North Substation. The existing ZCN route is already consented to operate at 400 kV enabling an increase in its capacity.
- Approximately 22 km of an existing overhead line (known as 'ZCS route' from Longannet to the proposed Kincardine North Substation. The ZCS route then continues to the existing Denny North Substation located approximately 1.5 km north of Denny. This forms part of a wider upgrade referred to as DWUP. The Proposed ZCS Upgrade comprise new terminal towers to turn in and connect both routes to the proposed Kincardine North Substation. The existing ZCS route is already consented to operate at 400 kV enabling an increase in its capacity.

1.2 Study Area

The Proposed Development is located around 0.5 km from the northern bank of the Upper Forth Estuary to the southwest, and approximately 0.6 km northeast of the town of Kincardine, covering an area of approximately 26 ha. The location of the Proposed Development is shown in **Figure 1.1** of the Overhead Line Upgrades and Kincardine North Substation EIA Report. It is bounded by the A876 to the west and the A977 and the Stirling-

Alloa-Kincardine railway line to the east. Arable agricultural fields are located within the Site, which has a largely flat topography below 10 m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD).

The Canal Burn runs along the west side of the Site, with several small drains and basins associated with it. Canal Burn discharges into the Upper Forth Estuary, which is considered as the ultimate receptor of any potential impacts.

1.3 Introduction to the Water Framework Directive

The Water Framework Directive (WFD)¹ aims to protect and enhance the quality of the water environment. It takes a holistic approach to the sustainable management of water by considering the interactions between surface water (including transitional and coastal waters, rivers, streams and lakes), groundwater and water-dependent ecosystems.

The WFD is transposed into environmental legislation in Scotland by the Water Environment and Water Services (Scotland) Act 2003 (WEWS Act, SEPA 2003)². Under the WFD, 'water bodies' are the basic management units, defined as all or part of a river system or aquifer. Water bodies form part of larger 'river basin districts' (RBD), for which 'River Basin Management Plans' (RBMPs) are used to summarise baseline conditions and set broad improvement objectives.

In Scotland, the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) is the competent authority for implementing the WFD, although many objectives will be delivered in partnership with other relevant public bodies and private organisations (e.g. local planning authorities, water companies, Rivers Trusts, large private landowners and developers). As part of its regulatory role and statutory consultee on planning applications and environmental permitting, The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 as amended in 2013³, and more commonly known as the Controlled Activity Regulations (CAR), apply regulatory controls over activities which may affect Scotland's water environment. SEPA must consider whether proposals for new developments have the potential to:

- Cause a deterioration of a water body from its current status or potential; and/or
- Prevent future attainment of good status or potential where not already achieved.

This WFD Screening and Scoping Assessment has been produced alongside the EIA Report for the Proposed Development. In particular, this report relates to and should be read in conjunction to **Chapter 9: Water Environment and Flood Risk**.

¹ Water Framework Directive 2000/60/EC. Available Online: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/eudr/2000/60/contents>

² Scottish Parliament, 2003. Water Environment Water Services ('the WEWS Act') (Scotland) Act 2003. Available Online: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2003/3/contents>

³ Scottish Parliament, 2011. The Water Environment (Controlled Activities) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 (as amended) (CAR) ('the CAR Regulations'). Available online: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2011/209/contents/made>

1.4 Assessment Process

There is no guidance produced by SEPA for undertaking a WFD assessment in Scotland, so Environment Agency^{4,5} and Planning Inspectorate⁶ guidance has been used instead. In accordance with the Planning Inspectorate's guidance, a three-stage approach has been adopted:

- **Stage 1 (Screening)** – Excludes any activities that do not need to go through scoping or impact assessment stages.
- **Stage 2 (Scoping)** – Identifies the receptors that are potentially at risk from the activities of the Proposed Development. For coastal and transitional water bodies the relevant receptors are defined in accordance with the Environment Agency Clearing the Waters Guidance⁵ and are based on the water body's quality elements which are:
 - o hydromorphology;
 - o water quality;
 - o biology – habitats;
 - o biology – fish; and
 - o protected areas.
- **Stage 3 (Impact Assessment)** – Considers the potential impacts of the activities, identifies ways to avoid or minimise impacts, and shows if the activities may cause deterioration or jeopardise the water body achieving good status.

This report comprises Stage 1 (Screening) and Stage 2 (Scoping) of the assessment process only, and it identifies whether Stage 3 (Impact Assessment) is required.

1.5 Desk Study

A desk study has been used as the basis for a qualitative review of the Proposed Development. Full details of the desk study are provided in **Chapter 9: Water Environment and Flood Risk**.

1.6 Assumptions and Limitations

The assessment is based on data available from online sources. For many water features in the study area there were no long-term water quality or hydrological data, and for others the data that were available were limited or obtained some time ago (and thus may not be wholly representative of current conditions). Given the nature of the Proposed Development this is considered acceptable.

This assessment should be read in light of the legislation, statutory requirements and /or industry good practice applicable at the time of the assessment being undertaken (July 2026).

⁴ Environment Agency, (2016). Water Framework Directive risk assessment: How to assess the risk of your activity. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/water-framework-directive-how-to-assess-the-risk-of-your-activity>

⁵ Environment Agency (2016). Clearing Waters for All. Water Framework Directive Assessment: estuarine and coastal waters. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/water-framework-directive-assessment-estuarine-and-coastal-waters>

⁶ The Planning Inspectorate (2025). Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on the Water Framework Directive. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nationally-significant-infrastructure-projects-advice-on-the-water-framework-directive>.

Any subsequent changes in this legislation, guidance or design may necessitate the findings to be reassessed in light of these circumstances.

2. WFD Screening

2.1 WFD Screening Overview

The purpose of the WFD screening stage, as outlined in the Planning Inspectorate's guidance 'Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on the Water Framework Directive'⁶, is to identify a zone of influence of the Proposed Development and to determine whether that influence has the potential to adversely impact upon WFD water body receptors. This approach has been taken in this assessment and is outlined below.

A Study Area of 1 km from the red line boundary of the Proposed Development has been considered in order to identify water bodies that are potentially hydrologically connected to the Proposed Development and potential works associated with the Proposed Development that could cause direct impacts.

The screening stage also identifies specific activities of the Proposed Development that could affect the WFD status of receptor water bodies, and which should be carried forward to subsequent stages of the assessment process. Justification is provided where water body receptors are screened out and are not carried forward through the assessment.

WFD water bodies which have the potential to interact with the Proposed Development have been identified using SEPA's Classification Hub⁷.

The Surface Water Bodies are shown in **Figure 9.1 Surface Water Receptors**, and the Groundwater Bodies are shown in **Figure 9.2 Groundwater Receptors**.

Screening of WFD Water Bodies

The Proposed Development has the potential to impact one WFD surface water body – the Upper Forth Estuary, which is the receiving water body of Canal Burn and other unnamed watercourses, which interact with the Proposed Development. Canal Burn and the unnamed watercourses which interact with the Proposed Development will be assessed as part of the Upper Forth Estuary WFD water body. The Upper Forth Estuary is screened in for assessment and a summary of the water body classifications is presented in Table 1. The water body is designated as heavily modified due to physical alterations that cannot be addressed without a significant impact from an increased risk of subsidence or flooding.

Table 1 WFD summary for the Upper Forth Estuary (200437) transitional water body

WFD Parameter	Status/Summary
Water Body ID	200437
Water Body Name	Upper Forth Estuary
Water Body Type	Transitional
Water Body Area (km ²)	9.7
Hydromorphological Designation	Heavily modified

⁷ SEPA [online]. Available: <https://www.sepa.org.uk/data-visualisation/water-classification-hub/>

WFD Parameter	Status/Summary
Overall ecological potential	Moderate
Pre-HMWB status	Moderate
Physico-chemical status	Good
Biological elements	Good
Specific Pollutants	Pass
Hydromorphology	Moderate

The Proposed Development also has the potential to impact one WFD groundwater body - Alloa. This water body is screened in for assessment as it underlies the footprint of the Proposed Development. A summary of the water body classification for the Alloa groundwater body is presented in Table 2.

The Longannet WFD groundwater body lies within the 1 km boundary of the Proposed Development, however, there are no activities which interact with the footprint of the water body and therefore there are no pathways for impact. Therefore, the Longannet WFD groundwater body has been screened out of further assessment.

Table 2 WFD summary for the Alloa groundwater body (150536)

WFD Parameter	Status/Summary
Water Body ID	150536
Water Body Name	Alloa
Water Body Type	Groundwater
Water Body Area (km)	62.3
Overall status	Poor
Quantitative status	Good
Quant – Saline Intrusion	Good
Quant – SW Interaction	Good
Water balance	Good
Chemical status	Poor
Chemical – SW Interaction	Good
Drinking Water Protected Area	Good
Chemical – General tests	Poor
Water quality	Poor

2.2 Screening of Activities

The Proposed Development comprises activities which present a potential risk to the WFD status of water bodies. These activities are listed in Table 3 together with a screening assessment.

Table 3 Screening of Activities

Activity	Description	Screening outcome	Justification
Construction of KINN	The construction of a new substation with foundations approximately 52,600 m ² with associated swales and SuDS basin for drainage around the footprint of the building.	<u>In</u> Alloa groundwater body <u>Out</u> Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body	The substation will be constructed over 60 m from watercourses and so it is unlikely that there will be any impacts that would affect WFD status of surface water bodies. This activity has therefore been screened out of further assessment for the Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body. There is potential that during excavation for the foundations, groundwater ingress may occur. There is the potential that accidental leakages or spills from construction could lead to pollutants leaching into groundwater bodies. Therefore, this activity is screened in for further assessment for the Alloa WFD Groundwater body.
Construction of OHL	XL Route New terminal towers on the XL route to connect to the substation. One existing tower will be removed and four new towers installed. ZCN and ZCS Route Proposed works to the ZCN and ZCS routes would include the construction of new terminal towers to turn in and	<u>In</u> Alloa groundwater body <u>Out</u> Upper Forth Estuary	All new pylon towers will be constructed at least 10 m from watercourses and so it is unlikely that there will be any impacts that would affect WFD status of surface water bodies. This activity has therefore been screened out of further assessment for the Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body. There is potential that during excavation for the foundations, groundwater ingress may occur. There is the potential that accidental leakages or spills from construction could lead to pollutants leaching into groundwater bodies. Therefore, this

Activity	Description	Screening outcome	Justification
	connect them to the Proposed Development as well as the removal and replacement of existing line towers. Overall, two existing towers are to be removed and six new towers installed. Temporary masts will be required to enable the continuous operation while permanent towers are constructed.	transitional water body	activity is screened in for further assessment for the Alloa WFD Groundwater body.
Underground cable installation	As part of the Scottish Power Distribution Works, OHL will be removed and replaced with UGC across the Proposed Development site, connecting these works with the KINN and then the existing Kincardine Substation to the south.	<u>In</u> Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body <u>Out</u> Alloa groundwater body	Open-cut trenching techniques will be used for cable installation. This has the potential to cause direct impacts to hydromorphology and water quality elements, therefore this activity is screened in for assessment for the Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body. Dimensions of the cable trench are yet to be finalised but are expected to be 0.2 m to 0.3 m in depth and is unlikely to impact the groundwater environment at this very shallow depth. Therefore, this activity is screened out for further assessment for the Alloa WFD Groundwater body.
Access tracks	Access tracks will follow existing farm tracks or be constructed across arable fields. The tracks will be	<u>In</u> Upper Forth Estuary	There is the potential for impacts to water quality if runoff or spillage occurs during access track upgrades. Additionally, the modification of culverts may impact on hydromorphological

Activity	Description	Screening outcome	Justification
	formed using compacted granular material. General access to the construction site will require upgrading of an existing access track, including reinforcement of an existing culvert. Access for abnormal loads will require upgrade of an existing watercourse crossing.	transitional water body <u>Out</u> Alloa groundwater body	quality elements of watercourses. Therefore, this activity is screened in for further assessment for the Upper Forth Estuary. It is unlikely that there would be any impacts on groundwater quality elements so the Alloa WFD groundwater body has been screened out of any further assessment.
Surface Water Drainage	Surface water runoff from the substation roof and hardstanding areas of the site will be conveyed via swales to a Sustainable Drainage System (SuDS) basin located in the southeast corner of the site. The water will be attenuated here set to a discharge rate of 14.2 l/s before discharging at a controlled rate to the nearest watercourse via a surface water pipe.	<u>In</u> <u>Upper Forth Estuary</u> <u>transitional water body</u>	There is potential for impacts to hydromorphology from the construction of surface water outfall pipe. Therefore this activity is screened in for further assessment for the Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body. It is assumed that the KINN, SuDS basin and swales will be constructed on a foundation of gravel with a lining to protect runoff from entering the groundwater beneath, though further details of this are to be confirmed at the detailed design stage. It is unlikely that there would be any impacts on groundwater quality elements so the Alloa WFD groundwater body has been screened out of any further assessment.

2.3 Screening of Sensitive Sites

The Firth of Forth Ramsar Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Protection Area (SPA) are located downstream of the Proposed Development within the Upper Forth Estuary WFD water body. However, flows within the River Forth are high, with a mean flow of 46.2 m³/s at the Forth at Craigforth gauging station⁸, which are likely to dilute any water quality impacts. Therefore it is unlikely that any water quality impacts from the Proposed Development would propagate downstream and impact on these sensitive sites. The presence of culverts has the potential to restrict downstream sediment supply, however as it is likely that little sediment is transported within Canal Burn within its current state so this is not likely to present a significant issue within the sensitive sites within the Upper Forth Estuary.

2.4 Summary of Screening Assessment

The WFD water body screening assessment screened WFD water bodies based on their potential to be impacted by the Proposed Development. One transitional and one groundwater body were screened in:

- Upper Forth Estuary transitional water body
- Alloa groundwater body

The screening assessment also screened Proposed Development activities based on their potential to impact water bodies. The following activities were screened in:

- Construction of the Kincardine North substation
- Construction of new pylon towers
- Access tracks

3. WFD Scoping

3.1 Overview

For each water body identified in the screening stage, a scoping assessment is carried out to identify the effects and potential risks to quality elements from all activities. The assessment is made taking into consideration embedded and standard mitigation.

A scoping assessment is required to determine whether any water body receptors may be impacted by the Proposed Development once embedded and standard mitigation has been considered. These receptors are defined on the basis of the Environment Agency Clearing the Waters Guidance⁵ (which is considered best practice despite not having been developed specifically for Scotland), and are based on the water body's quality elements. The receptors for surface water are

- Hydromorphology;
- Water Quality;

⁸ 18011 – Forth at Craigforth NRFA Gauging Station: Available at: <https://nrfa.ceh.ac.uk/data/station/meanflow/18011>

- Biology – fish and habitats; and
- Protected areas

For groundwater, qualitative and quantitative water body elements have been considered, based on the water body quality elements on the SEPA Water Classification Hub⁷.

3.2 Scoping of Upper Forth Estuary

Hydromorphology

The Proposed Development has the potential to affect hydromorphological quality elements in the Upper Forth Estuary water body.

During construction, there is a risk that runoff containing fine sediment could lead to negative impacts on hydromorphology. Works required to upgrade culverts for access tracks will likely cause direct hydromorphological impacts to tributaries of the Upper Forth Estuary and, therefore, may have negative impacts to the Upper Forth Estuary if not mitigated.

The scoping assessment of the potential effects to hydromorphology is provided in Table 4 below. The scoping assessment uses the Clearing Waters for All guidance as a basis for assessment, as the receiving WFD water body is a transitional water body. However, as there are freshwater watercourses which discharge to Upper Forth Estuary but not designated as a WFD water body in their own right, additional risks have been included within the assessment to take into account these watercourses.

Table 4 Assessment of hydromorphology risk from activity

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Hydromorphology Risk Issue(s)
Could impact on the hydromorphology (for example morphology or tidal patterns) of a water body at high status	N/A – water body not at high status	No	The Upper Forth Estuary transitional WFD water body is at moderate status. This is therefore scoped out of further assessment.
Could significantly impact the hydromorphology of any water body	Modifications to culverts will be designed to maintain connectivity and should be set below bed level to allow sedimentation and a naturalised bed to form. Such works will then be undertaken in a dry working environment, where possible, with flow temporarily over-pumped or flumed or isolated from the working area using sand/ pea	No	No physical works are required within the Upper Forth Estuary transitional WFD water body. Any impacts from modifications to culverts crossing tributaries of the Upper Forth Estuary and open-cut crossings of

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Hydromorphology Risk Issue(s)
	gravel bags or other similar and inert barrier to avoid increased flow that may scour or erode the morphological features of the watercourse. Where open-cut crossing techniques are used for cable installation, watercourses will be reinstated as found. A Pre-works Hydromorphological and Riparian Survey will be undertaken to provide the baseline against which reinstatement will be provided. Bank and bed sediments must be stored separately and in distinct layers as excavated on geotextile layers so they can be reinstated as found following completion of the works. The banks and the bed will need to be appropriately reprofiled with the inclusion of suitable geomorphic features with the aim to provide betterment on the original channel. Once the watercourses are reinstated, silt fences, geotextile matting or straw bales will be used initially to capture mobilised sediment until the watercourse has returned to a settled state. Regular observations of the watercourses will be undertaken post-works during vegetation re-establishment of the banks, to ensure that no adverse impacts have occurred. Pipe outfalls will be supported by sandbags and fitted with baffles to help dissipate		tributaries of the Upper Forth Estuary will be adequately mitigated by embedded and standard mitigation, and mitigation included in Chapter 14: Schedule of Mitigation. This is therefore scoped out of further assessment.

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Hydromorphology Risk Issue(s)
	energy and avoid erosion of the bed and bank. The above mitigation is outlined in Chapter 14: Schedule of Mitigation .		

Water Quality – Physico-chemical Quality Elements

There is the potential for chemical spillages and runoff containing contaminants related to works on or close to watercourses during construction. This includes an increase in sediment laden surface water runoff and mobilisation and fine sediments.

The scoping assessment of the potential effects to water quality is provided in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Assessment of water quality risks

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Water Quality Risk Issue(s)
Could affect water clarity, temperature, salinity, oxygen levels, nutrients or microbial patterns continuously for longer than a spring neap tidal cycle (about 14 days)	Plans to avoid, prevent and reduce adverse effects on the water environment and deal with any accidental pollution would be included within the CEMP prepared by the Contractor, prior to commencement of construction. The final CEMP will contain a Water Management Plan (WMP) which would provide details regarding standard mitigation to be implemented to protect the water environment from adverse impacts during construction. The drainage design will be based on Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) principles incorporating filter drains, swales and settlement ponds to manage and treat surface water runoff prior to	No	With the proposed mitigation measures and drainage design in place, impacts from mobilisation of sediments, surface water runoff containing contaminants or as a result of accidental spillages will be negligible, and not have an impact at the water body scale. This is therefore scoped out of further assessment.

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Water Quality Risk Issue(s)
	discharging back into watercourses. Further details are provided in Chapter 14 Schedule of Mitigation and the Kincardine North Surface Water Management Strategy.		

Biology – Habitats and Fish

Table 6 provides a high-level scoping assessment for habitats and fish. For the purposes of the table, the sensitivity of different habitats as defined by the Environment Agency⁵ are as follows: higher sensitivity habitats are chalk reefs, clam, cockle and oyster beds, intertidal seagrass, maerl, mussel beds (including blue and horse mussel), polychaete reefs, saltmarsh, subtidal kelp beds and subtidal seagrass. Lower sensitivity habitats are cobbles, gravel and shingle, intertidal soft sediments like sand and mud, rocky shores, subtidal boulder fields, subtidal rocky reefs and subtidal soft sediments.

Table 6 Scoping assessment of risks to biological marine habitats and fish

Footprint is	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Biological Quality Risk Issue(s)
0.5 km ² or larger	There are no direct works to the bed of The Upper Forth Estuary transitional WFD water body, and there are no works within 500 m of a sensitive habitat. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.	No	No physical works are required within the Upper Forth Estuary transitional WFD water body. Any works taking place on tributaries of the water body will be mitigated by measures outlined in a CEMP and Chapter 14: Schedule of Mitigation , and it is unlikely that impacts would propagate
1% or more of the water body's area			
Within 500 m of any higher sensitivity habitat ⁵			
1% or more of any lower sensitivity habitat ⁵			
In an estuary and could affect fish in the estuary, outside the estuary but could delay or prevent fish entering it or could affect	There are no activities that would impact on fish behaviour within the estuary. Any	No	

Footprint is	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	Biological Quality Risk Issue(s)
fish migrating through the estuary Could impact on normal fish behaviour like movement, migration or spawning (for example creating a physical barrier, noise, chemical change or a change in depth or flow)	modifications to culverts of tributaries of the Forth Estuary will be designed to maintain connectivity and will be set below bed level to allow sedimentation and a naturalised bed to form. All new watercourse crossings and upgrades will be designed following SEPA's information and guidance for crossings on watercourses and lochs. The above mitigation is included within Chapter 14: Schedule of Mitigation.		downstream. This is therefore scoped out of further assessment
Could cause entrainment or impingement of fish	NA	No	There are no activities that would cause entrainment or impingement of fish.

WFD protected areas

The location of the Proposed Development in relation to the following WFD Protected Areas has been considered:

- SAC (Special Area of Conservation);
- SPA;
- shellfish waters
- bathing waters
- nutrient sensitive areas

The outcome of the scoping assessment for WFD protected areas is shown in Table 7.

Table 7 Scoping assessment of risks to WFD protected areas

Risk	Proposed Mitigation	Requires Impact Assessment (Yes/No)	WFD protected area risk issue(s)
Activity is within 2 km of any WFD protected area	Plans to avoid, prevent, and reduce adverse effects on the water environment and deal with any accidental pollution would be included within the CEMP and WMP. Further details are provided in Chapter 14 Schedule of Mitigation.	Yes	The Proposed Development is within 2 km of WFD protected area of the Firth of Forth SPA.

Summary

Overall, it is considered that given the embedded and standard mitigation provided in **Chapter 9 Water Environment** and **Chapter 14 Schedule of Mitigation** that impacts to the Upper Forth Estuary WFD water body can be scoped out of detailed assessment.

3.3 Alloa WFD Groundwater Body

The Alloa WFD groundwater body underlies the Proposed Development. A scoping assessment of potential for impact against key parameters shown on the Water Classification Hub website for the water body is given in Table 8.

Table 8 Scoping assessment for Alloa Groundwater Body

WFD Parameter	Potential Risk	Mitigation	Scoped In/Out
Quantitative Status	During excavation of foundation areas for the installation of the substation and pylons, groundwater ingress may occur. This may require dewatering which has the potential to cause localised changes.	Ground investigation works will be undertaken to inform the most appropriate design and mitigation options. The CEMP and WMP outlines best practice measures for managing groundwater that is encountered.	There is potential to encounter groundwater temporarily during construction but given that it would be appropriately managed with measures outlined in the CEMP, then there would be no impact to quantitative status anticipated at the WFD groundwater body scale. As such, it is scoped out of further assessment.
Chemical Status	During excavation of foundation areas for the installation of the substation and pylons, groundwater ingress may occur. This has the potential to create temporary pathways along which contaminants from construction works could pass. Potential impacts include groundwater contamination from accidental spills and deterioration of groundwater quality from uncontrolled construction runoff.	The CEMP will outline best practice measures for managing construction runoff and any spillages that occur on site in order to prevent any impact on groundwater	The superficial aquifers have a dominance of clay deposits, meaning that if contamination occurs it is unlikely to be widespread. Additionally, the implementation of mitigation measures through the CEMP will minimise potential risks to groundwater quality. Therefore, chemical status can be scoped out of further assessment.

Overall, it is considered that given the mitigation provided, that impacts to the Alloa WFD Groundwater body can be scoped out of further assessment.

4. Conclusion

A WFD screening and scoping exercise has been undertaken for the Proposed Development. Proposed work activities that could adversely influence water bodies have been outlined and have been assessed alongside embedded and standard mitigation to determine whether proposed would have an impact on WFD water bodies. The following water bodies were screened in:

- Upper Forth Estuary
- Alloa Groundwater

It is considered that with embedded and standard mitigation, and mitigation to be included in the CEMP and WMP as outlined in **Chapter 9: Water Environment and Flood Risk** and **Chapter 14: Schedule of Mitigation**, it is unlikely that there would be a deterioration in WFD status of water bodies and that the Proposed Development is compliant with WFD objectives. Therefore, it is not recommended to undertake further assessment.