

Colm Fraser

From: Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 November 2021 17:28
To: Ian Murdoch
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G; Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Colm Fraser; Lisa Johnson; Marion Finlayson; Park, Michael; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Lorna.King@gov.scot; Maclean, Ruth; Ambrose, Nick; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Miller, Rebecca
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Categories: AAAAFile

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Hi Ian,
On condition 5 where query is addressed to APHA
See my comments below in [green](#).

Best regards.

Rui M.C. Couchinho; DVM MRCVS

Veterinary Advisor - Field Delivery

APHA Scotland Field Services (Galashiels)

Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA)

Telephone: [REDACTED] | Email: rui.couchinho@apha.gov.uk

Website: www.gov.uk/apha | Twitter: [@APHAgovuk](https://twitter.com/APHAgovuk) | Facebook: [APHAgov](https://www.facebook.com/APHAgov)

Address: APHA Perth Field Services, Strathearn House, Broxden Business Park, Lamberkine Drive, Perth, PH1 1RX

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37
To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; lisa.johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.macleon@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose, Nick <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Miller, Rebecca <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current

burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- **Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL**
- **What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?** Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- **What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?** In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- **Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?**

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method as disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
e: Lorna.King@gov.scot
w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no banded pits)

2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

[Couchinho, Rui (APHA)]

A C&D procedure stripped to bare essentials has only two steps (cleansing and disinfection) but the cleaning step can be as simple as just a sweep or long and complex (flushing, soaking with water at different temperatures, application of different detergents with or without scrubbing, etc...) depends on concrete conditions on the ground.

The cleaning step removes contamination by physically removing organic material and exposing inert surfaces as much as possible, the disinfection step intends to kill any lingering pathogens and must use a disinfectant approved by DEFRA under the General Diseases Order applied to the concentration required under said Order for an adequate amount of time.

In this method statement, considering we are just looking at skips, the steam clean is probably enough to achieve adequate cleaning, however, I would insist on the operator laying out a disinfection step where he clarifies: which DEFRA approved disinfectant will be used; what concentration will it be used and how long will it be allowed to be in contact with clean surfaces of skip.

I would suggest that if the legal advice is to include more detail with this condition, then the condition could be worded slightly different:

“5 - Skips to be cleaned and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority.”

6. Only routine morts from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

‘Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received’

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified , you could say

‘Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....’

7. Any disposal of event mortis have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an “event”. Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it’s necessary to refer to ‘event’ mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I’m not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I’m not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it’s the latter and if there’s a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancelation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within Defra systems we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Defra's computer systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Colm Fraser

From: Charles.Allan@gov.scot
Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20
To: Lorna.King@gov.scot; Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G; Colm Fraser; Lisa Johnson; Marion Finlayson; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Maclean, Ruth; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Some people who received this message don't often get email from charles.allan@gov.scot. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November
Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given.

In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]

e: Lorna.King@gov.scot

w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. **Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?**
3. **No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.**

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish mortis to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine mortis from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify. Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

‘Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received’

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified, you could say

‘Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....’

7. Any disposal of event mortis have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an “event”. Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it’s necessary to refer to ‘event’ mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I’m not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I’m not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it’s the latter and if there’s a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancellation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

Colm Fraser

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37
To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G; Colm Fraser; Lisa Johnson; Marion Finlayson; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Maclean, Ruth; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)? Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime? In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish

morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method as disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>
Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00
To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; McDonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>
Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
e: Lorna.King@gov.scot
w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)

2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. **Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?**

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine morts from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

‘Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received’

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified , you could say

‘Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....’

7. Any disposal of event morts have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an “event”. Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it’s necessary to refer to ‘event’ mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I’m not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I’m not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it’s the latter and if there’s a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition

which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to be forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancellation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

Colm Fraser

From: Donaldson, Fiona <Fiona.Donaldson@SEPA.org.uk>
Sent: 04 November 2021 09:57
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot; Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G; Colm Fraser; Lisa Johnson; Marion Finlayson; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; Maclean, Ruth; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Some people who received this message don't often get email from fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

OFFICIAL

Ian,

Regarding the PPC permit process: we are continuing dialogue with Whiteshore Cockles and we believe that they have the resources available to develop a proposal that will meet the relevant requirements. We have asked them for an indication of when they expect to be able to submit a permit application and I will let you know their response. Taking various factors into account, a likely timeline would be an application received by March 2022, and a permit issued by December 2022. They could then begin commissioning once they have the permit in place and this is likely to last at least 2 months. The site is likely start to waste processing in March 2023. This timescale could be advanced, but this is dependent on the quality of the permit application and more crucially, the emissions control measures being employed at the site.

It is our understanding that Whiteshore Cockles intend re-evaluate a number of the proposed emissions control measures to meet the relevant requirements in light of SEPA's feedback on the withdrawn application. Discussions with their new consultancy support indicate odour treatment system, as well as other areas, will need to be redesigned. We are awaiting Whiteshore Cockles to confirm its approach in writing. Subject to this confirmation, it is SEPA's view that they should be allowed some time to properly develop these measures, but this has to be balanced with the continued operation of burial activities.

The options are to extend the derogation to 31/3/23 or until the PPC permit is in place, whichever is the earlier, or they have to find another treatment route in the meantime.

Regards,

Fiona

Fiona Donaldson

T: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37

To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot

Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; Donaldson, Fiona <Fiona.Donaldson@SEPA.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.macleon@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)? Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime? In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method as disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel: [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
e: Lorna.King@gov.scot
w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.macleon@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)

2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine mortis from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

‘Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received’

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified , you could say

‘Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....’

7. Any disposal of event mortis have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an “event”. Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it’s necessary to refer to ‘event’ mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I’m not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I’m not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it’s the latter and if there’s a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancelation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

Colm Fraser

From: Donaldson, Fiona <Fiona.Donaldson@SEPA.org.uk>
Sent: 09 November 2021 13:59
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot; Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G; Colm Fraser; Lisa Johnson; Marion Finlayson; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; Maclean, Ruth; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Some people who received this message don't often get email from fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

OFFICIAL

Just to update you on the Whiteshore Cockles PPC permit timeline: we have had discussions with the operator and they have advised they expect to be able to submit a permit application in early 2022 with the timing dependent on some further work they need to undertake to design the emissions control infrastructure. Therefore the timeline indicated below is reasonable.

Regards,

Fiona

Fiona Donaldson

T: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]

From: Donaldson, Fiona
Sent: 04 November 2021 09:57
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot; Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.macleon@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Regarding the PPC permit process: we are continuing dialogue with Whiteshore Cockles and we believe that they have the resources available to develop a proposal that will meet the relevant requirements. We have asked them for an indication of when they expect to be able to submit a permit application and I will let you know their response. Taking various factors into account, a likely timeline would be an application received by March 2022, and a permit issued by December 2022. They could then begin commissioning once they have the permit in place and this is likely to last at least 2 months. The site is likely start to waste processing in March 2023. This timescale could be advanced, but this is

dependent on the quality of the permit application and more crucially, the emissions control measures being employed at the site.

It is our understanding that Whiteshore Cockles intend re-evaluate a number of the proposed emissions control measures to meet the relevant requirements in light of SEPA's feedback on the withdrawn application. Discussions with their new consultancy support indicate odour treatment system, as well as other areas, will need to be redesigned. We are awaiting Whiteshore Cockles to confirm its approach in writing. Subject to this confirmation, it is SEPA's view that they should be allowed some time to properly develop these measures, but this has to be balanced with the continued operation of burial activities.

The options are to extend the derogation to 31/3/23 or until the PPC permit is in place, whichever is the earlier, or they have to find another treatment route in the meantime.

Regards,

Fiona

Fiona Donaldson

T: [REDACTED]
M: [REDACTED]

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37

To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot

Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; Donaldson, Fiona <Fiona.Donaldson@SEPA.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.macleon@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL
- What is the difference in what is to be achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)? Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime? In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- Why does a disposal plan need to be forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to be forwarded every time?

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not to be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method of disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; McDonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
e: Lorna.King@gov.scot
w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk.
Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area

the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine morts from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

‘Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received’

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified , you could say

‘Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....’

7. Any disposal of event morts have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an “event”. Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it's necessary to refer to 'event' mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I'm not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I'm not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancelation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

Colm Fraser

From: Colm Fraser
Sent: 17 November 2021 16:59
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Cc: Kenny MacLeod | G; Lisa Johnson (lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November
Attachments: Method Statement.docx

Afternoon Ian

As you know the main reason we have been pushing for the controls and conditions on the operation is the level of smell emanating from the site rather than from ABP controls. This is causing significant impact on the neighbouring area and can be detected from a large distance.

The Animal Health Officer was at the site on 1st November and although the site appeared relatively tidy there were approximately 11 banded pits “open” in that they were covered in seaweed, which does little to prevent odour escape. The pits can’t be covered with sand as it sinks into the liquid and would cause overflow. The operators have to wait for the waste to solidify enough/drain before properly covering and the pits will continue to emit smell until they can be fully covered. This is not in compliance with their existing method statement.

My understanding was that the site was allowed to continue burying waste to ensure that there was a local solution for routine morts and to ensure that staff could be employed until the new plant was up and running; however, there are no restrictions on the quantities they are taking.

There appears to have been significant quantities disposed of over the last few weeks and appears to be ongoing due to fish farm events/incidents, which may explain the 11 pits. The quantities involved in “event” mortalities again brings the site’s capacity into question and increases the level and duration of odours. It is likely that some of these “open” pits will not be covered properly for months. This aerial photo, which appears to be relatively recent, gives an indication of some of the pits and limited land available. <https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@57.5696889,-7.4600288,490m/data=!3m1!1e3>.

We asked Whiteshores for details of what has been buried over the last period. The figures they supplied showed over 9800 tonnes buried in the last 16 months. Their method statement says the site has a capacity to hold 40,000 tonnes. These figures indicate that they have utilised nearly a quarter of the site’s capacity in 16 months. If these figures are representative of previous years, even with natural breakdown, I would seriously question what capacity, if any, the site has remaining.

Also for context – assuming a 4 metre pit is achievable and 1m³ per ton – to bury October’s waste (~1160 m³) would need the equivalent of a 17m x 17m pit.

We agreed to monitor the site using the proposed conditions below and based on the derogation ending on 31 March 2022. Given this date is now unlikely and they can’t effectively comply with the main conditions that could limit odours I honestly don’t see any real point in arranging monitoring as it will do little to mitigate the smells. Also based on the current method of disposal there are likely to be open pits well after the derogation end date.

Fiona said the options are to extend the derogation to 31/3/23 or until the PPC permit is in place, whichever is the earlier, or they have to find another treatment route in the meantime. Given the ongoing concerns regarding capacity and odour, I don’t see how we can support extending the derogation.

Regards

Colm

--

Colm Fraser

Colm Friseal (Colm Fraser) | Manaidsear Seirbheisean Luchd-Cleachdaidh agus Arainneachd (Consumer and Environmental Services Manager)

Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Rathad Shanndabhaig | Steornabhagh | Eilean Leodhais | HS1 2BW

Communities Department | [Comhairle nan Eilean Siar](#) | Sandwich Road | Stornoway | Isle of Lewis | HS1 2BW
cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk | [www.cne-siar.gov.uk](#)

Links to further service information:

[COVID](#)

[Trading Standards](#)

[Food Safety](#)

[Health and Safety at Work](#)

[Licensing](#)

[Animal Health & Welfare](#)

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

Ag Obair Comhla airson na h-Eileanan Siar **COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR** Working Together for the Western Isles



From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37

To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot

Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Marion Finlayson <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- **Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL**
- **What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?** Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- **What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?** In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- **Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?**

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method as disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk;
lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk;
fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>;
kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk;
Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk;
Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management

regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare
Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mob: [REDACTED]
e: Lorna.King@gov.scot
w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <lan.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)

2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine morts from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding ‘routine’. I’m unclear how ‘routine’ is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

'Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received'

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified, you could say

'Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....'

7. Any disposal of event mortalities have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an "event". Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I don't think it's necessary to refer to 'event' mortalities. I can't think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I'm not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I'm not clear if pre-notification is required. So accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to be achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteshore to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to be forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to be forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNES to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancellation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

Colm Fraser

From: Lisa Johnson
Sent: 04 October 2022 17:26
To: Colm Fraser
Subject: Fwd: Stench - Bayhead

Categories: AAAAFile

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Sent: Tuesday, October 4, 2022 2:41:24 PM
To: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Cc: Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Marion Finlayson <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Stench - Bayhead
WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Hi Lisa

No new conditions were officially placed on Whiteshore Cockles so the derogation to bury is still on-going. However, they did agree to operate to the conditions we discussed (i.e. no raised pits, pits to be covered overnight etc).

The fish dryer is still undergoing the approval process with SEPA for a Part A PPC permit. This is still the latest delay and dialogue between Whiteshores Cockles and SEPA is still going on. I have had recent correspondence from Whiteshore Cockles that they are trying to get it up and running for 1 November 2022 but we are still unsure if this will be agreed by SEPA.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch
Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government
Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 October 2022 11:09
To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Cc: Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Marion Finlayson <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Stench - Bayhead

Good morning Ian,

Please see below complaint regarding the Whiteshores Cockles site in Bayhead, North Uist. Where are we with this? From your previous correspondence the current disposal plan was 'To end on 31/03/22', although it did say this was to be debated. I was under the impression that it would only be a few months until the new plant was operational, however those plans seem to have stalled with SEPA and so this surely can't go on indefinitely?

If you could respond to the complainant directly please, thanks.

Kind regards,

Lisa Johnson Ch.EHO MREHIS
Chartered Environmental Health Officer

Communities Department
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar
Balivanich
Isle of Benbecula
HS7 5LA

Tel: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Environmental Health <eh@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 October 2022 11:11
To: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Stench - Bayhead

Good Morning

Please see email below.

Kind regards

Communities Department | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Sandwich Road
| Stornoway | Isle of Lewis | HS1 2BW | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]
| www.cne-siar.gov.uk/envserv/
Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Rathad Shanndabhaig | Steòrnabhaigh | Eilean Leòdhais |
HS1 2BW | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | www.cne-siar.gov.uk/envserv/

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c Tha Seirbheisean Ceannach agus Tìrshlàinteachd a' cur luach air ur beachdan gu piseach a thoirt air an t-seirbheis. Nach cuir sibh thugainn ur beachdan tron t-suirbhìdh ghoirid seo: www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

-----Original Message-----

From: Laura Beaton <uibhist1@hotmail.co.uk>

Sent: 03 October 2022 10:47
To: Environmental Health <eh@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: Stench - Bayhead

[You don't often get email from uibhist1@hotmail.co.uk. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

I am writing to complain about the ongoing stench affecting Knockintorran and originating from the fish processing plant on the local machair.

We were advised this plant would not operate until new equipment was in situ to stop the stench. This is not the case as the factory is operational and we are regularly unable to open windows and doors for the stench of rotten fish blowing on the wind.

This has been going on for years and is obviously not resolved. The issue continues to affect residents on the west side of Uist and must have health implications for the local population as well as being detrimental to our ability to live normal and healthy outdoor lives.

The factory operates day and night over 7 days so there is no let up from this intrusion.

Please can you advise why this is being allowed to continue and what is being done about resolving this ongoing environmental health issue for local residents?

Yours sincerely,

Laura Beaton

Sent from my iPhone

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

British Sign Language (BSL) users can contact us directly by using [contactSCOTLAND-BSL](#)



From: [Kenny MacLeod | G](#)
To: [Colm Fraser](#)
Cc: [Lisa Johnson](#)
Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles
Date: 25 March 2022 14:09:05

From: rthomp4521@btinternet.com <rthomp4521@btinternet.com>
Sent: 25 March 2022 13:46
To: Ian Murdoch <ian.murdoch@gov.scot>; Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: Whiteshore Cockles

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Ian, Kenny,

Hope all is well with you both.

After two and a half years and countless consultants our Part A PPC application was submitted to SEPA yesterday.

The application has hundreds of pages of information attached to it and if you want a copy please let me know.

If you can exert any pressure on SEPA to process the application asap I would be obliged as we are in the final stages of preparing / commissioning the equipment and will be ready for operation once the permit is granted.

i am sure we will all be glad once the new system is in full flow.

Any queries please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Ralph Thompson

██████████

From: [Colm Fraser](#)
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible
Date: 21 October 2022 17:34:00

Afternoon Ian

I refer to the complaint below and your response to Lisa. That's fine; for information, given our limited ability to deal with any complaints about the site, our proposed response to this and any future complaint we receive will be

Thank you for raising your concerns. We are aware of the issues with the site and are somewhat restricted in any action we can take as the Scottish Government granted its authority to allow the burial of fish morts to continue, on this site, on condition that burial would end when a fish waste processing facility, planned for the site was granted a PPC permit from SEPA.

This derogation prevents the Comhairle considering the activities of the site under animal by-product regulations and restricts its ability to investigate smell complaints associated with the activity.

If you have any queries regarding the derogation, then they are best directed to the Scottish Government (Animal Health and Welfare Division). The contact we have is Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot.

If you have another email address you wish us to use rather than your personal one then let me know.

Also, do you have any further updates regarding timescales for the site to obtain the various permissions as we have had very little information since just after the Task & Finish meeting in November last year. Is it worthwhile having a meeting with yourselves, SEPA and APHA to get a progress update?

Regards

Colm

--

Colm Fraser

Colm Friseal (Colm Fraser) | Manaidsear Seirbheisean Luchd-Cleachdaidh agus Arainneachd (Consumer and Environmental Services Manager) Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Rathad Shanndabhaig | Steornabhagh | Eilean Leodhais | HS1 2BW Communities Department | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Sandwick Road | Stornoway | Isle of Lewis | HS1 2BW cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk | www.cne-siar.gov.uk/eh | Contact us

Links to further service information:

Trading Standards

Food Safety

Health and Safety at Work

Licensing

Animal Health & Welfare

Fees & Charges

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

Ag Obair Comhla airson na h-Eileanan Siar COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR Working Together for the Western Isles

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>

Sent: 21 October 2022 10:25

To: Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible

Kind regards,

Lisa Johnson Ch.EHO MREHIS

Chartered Environmental Health Officer

Communities Department

Comhairle nan Eilean Siar

Balivanich

Isle of Benbecula

HS7 5LA

Tel: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: lan.Murdoch@gov.scot <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 21 October 2022 10:22

To: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Hi Lisa

I think in the first instance we would expect Comhairle nan Eilean Siar to respond to this correspondence as it is addressed to the council. Sorry to not be more helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>

Sent: 20 October 2022 10:03

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible

Morning Iain,

Please see below complaint regarding Whiteshores, are you ok to respond to the complainant?

Kind regards,

Lisa Johnson Ch.EHO MREHIS
Chartered Environmental Health Officer
Communities Department
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar
Balivanich
Isle of Benbecula
HS7 5LA
Tel: [REDACTED]
Mobile: [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Environmental Health <eh@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Sent: 20 October 2022 08:56
To: Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible

Good Morning

Please see email below.

Kind regards

Communities Department | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Sandwick Road

| Stornoway | Isle of Lewis | HS1 2BW | [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] |

| www.cne-siar.gov.uk/envserv/

Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan | Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Rathad Shannabhaig | Steòrnabhagh | Eilean Leòdhais | HS1 2BW | [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] | [REDACTED] | www.cne-siar.gov.uk/envserv/

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c Tha Seirbheisean Ceannach agus Tìrshlàinteachd a' cur luach air ur beachdan gu piseach a thoirt air an t-seirbheis. Nach cuir sibh thugainn ur beachdan tron t-suirbhidh ghoirid seo: www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

-----Original Message-----

From: Clowes Oates <mk13bzc@gmail.com>
Sent: 19 October 2022 19:24
To: Environmental Health <eh@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Subject: Foul smell - Whiteshore Cockles, Paible

[You don't often get email from mk13bzc@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDISK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Hello,

On Sunday 16 October my husband and I took a walk on North Uist. We parked on the coast, just past the Tractor Shed Camping Huts & Bunkhouse (off the A865). As soon as we got out of the car there we could smell something foul, clearly death and decay, and it became worse as we walked along the beach. We eventually realised the smell was coming from the Whiteshore Cockles processing facility. By the time we were alongside it the stench was almost unbearable.

On returning home I found various articles on the Web, saying that the practice of burying dead salmon in the dunes and covering them with seaweed has been illegal since 2016, but Whiteshore Cockles were continuing to do this. There was an expectation that they would cease by March 2022. However, they are obviously still continuing to do it - judging by the recent tyre marks in the sand, even on a Sunday. Can you tell me if you are content to allow the foul smells to continue, or when you expect them to cease. We will not visit that beach again until the stench has gone, and I feel very sorry for the residents and holiday-makers in the Paible area.

Kind regards,

Briony

Professor Briony J Oates, 22 Torlum, Isle of Benbecula. HS7 5PP

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: rthomp4521@btinternet.com
To: [Kenny MacLeod I G](#); [Colm Fraser](#); [Lisa Johnson](#); [Marion Finlayson](#); [Rui Couchinho@apha.gov.uk](#); [Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk](#); [Donaldson, Fiona](#); [Maclean, Ruth](#); [Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot](#); [Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot](#); [Ian.Hastie@gov.scot](#); [Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot](#); [Lorna.King@gov.scot](#); [Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot](#)
Subject: Re: Task and Finish Group - Whiteshore Cockles future fish waste burial conditions
Date: 07 December 2021 18:04:19

Some people who received this message don't often get email from rthomp4521@btinternet.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDASK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Meeting.

Thanks Ian I can then go through the different topics raised if that's acceptable. Most of them are no problem but some of them need discussing due to logistical / weather conditions that some of the committee are provably not aware of.

An agreed plan etc would be excellent for all interested parties.

Best regards

Ralph Thompson

On 7 Dec 2021, 14:57 +0000, Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot, wrote:

Afternoon Thanks for completing the Doodle Poll. Monday 13 December at 15:30 looked to be the most suitable time for everyone. Draft agenda Welcome and introductions – allBackground to Task and Finish Group – Ian MUpdate from Whiteshore Cockles Ltd – Ralph are you ok to give a general update on how your site operates and any progress with PPC permit?Discussion on proposed burial waste conditions – allNext steps – Ian M Thanks

Ian **Ian J Murdoch**Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish GovernmentTel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)Or call in (audio only)

[REDACTED] United Kingdom, Edinburgh

Phone Conference ID: [REDACTED] [#Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)SCOTS Connect[Learn More](#) | [Help](#) | [Meeting options](#)

***** This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return. Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.*****

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
To: Charles.Allan@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Cc: Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot; [Kenny MacLeod I G](mailto:Kenny.MacLeod.I.G); [Colm Fraser](mailto:Colm.Fraser); [Lisa Johnson](mailto:Lisa.Johnson); [Marion Finlayson](mailto:Marion.Finlayson); Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; [Maclean, Ruth](mailto:Maclean.Ruth); Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November
Date: 24 November 2021 11:22:31

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Hi both

I just wanted to double check you were content with the conditions 2 and 7?

Ian

From: Murdoch IJ (Ian)
Sent: 02 November 2021 16:37
To: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>
Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Thanks Charles and Lorna, both of your comments are helpful

Going back to Lorna's email, on the record keeping, I think we can make a work around on GDPR issues. WCL should be keeping commercial documents of all consignments going to the site under ABP Regulations. I am sure a system can be adapted to rely this information to CNeS for official supervision purposes. I will let CNeS comment on frequency of providing this data.

On event mortality, it is important we distinguish mortality that is above background levels. From what you say FHI already make this distinction, so this is not new. We have concerns about the current burial procedures and site capacity to bury fish morts at WCL. This is the reason we are reviewing the burial derogation to make it easier for CEnS to official supervise the site. The geographical condition should reduce the current volume of morts going to the site. However, we should also be aware of mortality levels above background levels to ensure disposal is managed properly. You mentioned the FHI provide guidance when levels rise above background, does it refer to ABP regulations?

On your questions:

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore? Only WCL

- **What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?** Condition 2 is general record keeping compliance. Condition 7 would be to ensure large scale disposal is managed properly i.e. not sitting uncovered for days.
- **What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?** In theory, we would not reject any request from fish farms local to WCL. We are trying to prevent large quantities of/any fish morts from out with Barra and Uist being disposed of at WCL.
- **Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?**

A disposal plan is needed because burial of fish morts is not be allowed. We have temporarily allowed burial for WCL and these conditions apply to WCL only. We want to ensure that fish morts that are not included under the derogation are not getting buried at WCL. We want to maintain strict conditions for any fish farms that plan to use WCL as their method as disposal. So if a fish farm needs to use WCL for above background (event mortality) disposal then we need to have a process of recording that use.

Hope this is helpful.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

*Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division |
Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government*
Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>

Sent: 02 November 2021 09:20

To: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Folks

I support the comments that Lorna has made, particularly querying why we are

differentiating between routine, and non-routine – the challenges for alternative disposal routes are similar, or increased for non-routine. The challenge for the Uists / Barra is the current lack of disposal options and the difficulty of transporting the mortality off-island.

From the perspective of disease control, the challenge is to offer a biosecure disposal option at a reasonable distance from the source of the mortalities, whilst minimising nuisance.

With regard to what defines the farms in the Uists / Barra, I think of them as being the farms with their operating shore base in the Uists / Barra, regardless of where they are spatially in the sea.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Charles Allan

Fish Health Inspectorate Group Leader

Marine Scotland | Marine Laboratory | 375 Victoria Road | Aberdeen | AB11 9DB

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mobile: [REDACTED]

www.gov.scot/marinescotland

From: King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>

Sent: 29 October 2021 09:00

To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Cc: Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>; Allan C (Charles) (MARLAB) <Charles.Allan@gov.scot>; kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk; cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk; lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; McDonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: FW: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Ian,

Hopefully the comments below are helpful but have copied Charles (FHI) in for additional comment / correction if he has anything to add.

From our perspective mortality for disposal is mortality for disposal i.e. whatever the volume, cause or 'event' the end result is fish which needs disposed of in accordance with waste management regulations. Legislation and Scottish Government policy is in place regarding mortality issues which arise during production. For example, mortality above 'background levels' is reported to the Fish Health Inspectorate, considered, investigated if necessary and managed according to advice given. In the event that a notifiable disease was found, the

enforcement of contingency measures and advice by the FHI would ensure waste was disposed of in accordance with disease management measures.

Therefore I'm not seeing the need for distinction in conditions between 'routine' mortality of otherwise, and whether the mortality is the result of an 'event' or not. I recommend the conditions focus on waste management irrespective of the reason or volume for the waste. Some information regarding mortality on sites and cause is reported in the public domain and I would caution against the conditions being used to generate information on mortality for any reason other than monitoring of waste management at the site. There's may also be a data protection issue to be considered with regards to the collection of data which is not required for waste management purposes.

This provides the context for my comments below.

I'm happy to chat about my comments if it would be helpful.

Lorna

Lorna King

(Working days Monday, Wednesday, Thursday)

Head of fish health and welfare

Marine Scotland – Aquaculture and Recreational Fisheries

Scottish Government | Area GB-North | Victoria Quay| Edinburgh| EH6 6QQ

Tel: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]

e: Lorna.King@gov.scot

w: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/marinescotland>

From: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 28 October 2021 16:03

To: Kenny MacLeod - Western Isles Council (kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk) <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser - Western Isles Council (cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk) <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk; Couchinho, Rui Miguel <Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk>; Park, Michael <Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk>; Donaldson, Fiona <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>; Pliatsikas P (Panos) <Panos.Pliatsikas@gov.scot>

Cc: Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - for comment by 19 November

Hello

I have received advice from my Scottish Government legal colleagues on the fish waste burial conditions. Nothing major to change but they would like to see a bit more detail in the conditions. I have highlighted the conditions that need more detail and put in bold who I think is best placed to advise.

Burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. Am assuming this is to monitor compliance that the site is only receiving from the geographic area the derogation is intended to support and appropriate use of site capacity rather than to mortality per se, because the latter would not be appropriate. Is weekly the correct frequency?

3. No pits left uncovered overnight – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept.

Further specification on the meaning “uncovered”. Greater specificity on the requirements will make it easier to establish a breach of the condition. We have this in the original Method Statement - Hole is covered in sand. If the pit has capacity left then a predator net is firmly secured over the site. Probably a question for **CnES**, is this what you would be looking for by having the pits covered?

4. Fish morts to be buried within 4 hours of arriving on site.

Recommend changing to – Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site.

5. Skips to be cleaned immediately on emptying.

More detail on cleaning requirements, again to be clearer is condition has been breached. Method statement states - The empty bins are transported to the wash area where they are steam cleaned and disinfected before the lids are attached with cable ties. Are we content with this condition? Maybe **APHA** could state example to follow?

6. Only routine morts from Uist & Barra

Is routine sufficiently clear? Same with Uist and Barra. Would “from fish cultivated in waters [around/within x distance of] the coastline of Uist and Barra and any inland waters of those islands [if there are any fish on inland waters]” be more appropriate? Suggest **Marine Scotland** advise.

The Marine area is usually described by nautical miles from mean high spring tides. Alternatively it could be described by the planning authority jurisdiction which extends down to Mean Low Water Springs, with the exception of fish farming which extends out to 12 nautical miles. However if there is a need to

distinguish between sites off Uist and Barra only then you may just have to specify

Also see my introductory comments regarding 'routine'. I'm unclear how 'routine' is being defined or why it matters. I would suggest its not relevant.

I suggest

'Only animal by-product waste from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received'

Or if the specific islands of Barra and (both?) Uist and not other islands need to be specified , you could say

'Only animal by-product waste from finish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses within coastal waters immediately adjacent to island X, island Y,....'

7. Any disposal of event morts have to be pre-notified to CNES & SG with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

Specification on an "event". Could **Marine Scotland** provide advice on event mortality? I dont think it's necessary to refer to 'event' mortalities. I cant think why the reason for mortality is relevant. It can be argued that any mortality is the result of an event.

I'm not familiar with legislation requirements of waste disposal and notification obligations, so I'm not clear if pre-notification is required. so accept the following as suggestions for clarifying with a view to improving the condition.

- Who do these conditions apply to - whiteshore or the fish farms? I assume the conditions can only apply to whiteshore?
- What is the difference in what is to achieved by condition (2) and condition (7)?
- What is the fish farm or whiteside to do i.e. notify only or notify and wait for approval? Because it's the latter and if there's a delay to approval, what do you expect the fish farm to do with mortalities in the meantime?
- Why does a disposal plan need to forwarded everytime? Is it an operational requirement of the fish farm to have a disposal plan and is this not checked via other routes than a condition which applies to whiteshore? And equally if the conditions only apply to whiteshore than why does the disposal plan need to forwarded every time?

8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated

9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced weekly inspection.

10. Whiteshores will pay £200+vat for CNES monitoring

There may be scope for CNeS to charge but it should be removed from the conditions.

Burial derogation

We are wanting to move away from an open ended derogation. The new derogation is likely to remain in place until 31 March (at which point it would come to an end), although subject to cancellation by the Scottish Ministers if Whiteshore Cockles fails to adhere to the conditions.

On top of the conditions, an additional event that might lead to the cancellation of the derogation could be the refusal of the PPC Permit. Burial is not a long term solution, so failure to get a PPC Permit would mean the aquaculture industry seek alternative disposal routes. Can **SEPA** advise on appealing a refusal of a the PPC Permit? Could a revised application be made after the initial refusal?

In any case, the new derogation will not make a categorical statement that a new derogation will not be granted if the existing one comes to an end. That will enable us to have a full range of options available to it.

Grateful for comment by 19 November.

Thanks

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

*Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division |
Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government*

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: [Colm Fraser](#)
To: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste
Date: 25 November 2021 16:13:00
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Afternoon Iain

Did you get my email of 17th November?

Colm

--

Colm Fraser

Colm Friseal (Colm Fraser) | Manaidsear Seirbheisean Luchd-Cleachdaidh agus Arainneachd
(Consumer and Environmental Services Manager)
[Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan](#) | [Comhairle nan Eilean Siar](#) | [Rathad Shanndabhaig](#) | [Steornabhagh](#) |
[Eilean Leodhais](#) | HS1 2BW
Communities Department | [Comhairle nan Eilean Siar](#) | [Sandwick Road](#) | [Stornoway](#) | [Isle of Lewis](#)
| HS1 2BW
cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk | [\[REDACTED\]](#) | [\[REDACTED\]](#) | www.cne-siar.gov.uk

Links to further service information:

[COVID](#)
[Trading Standards](#)
[Food Safety](#)
[Health and Safety at Work](#)
[Licensing](#)
[Animal Health & Welfare](#)

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

Ag Obair Comhla airson na h-Eileanan Siar **COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR** Working Together for the Western Isles



From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Sent: 25 November 2021 16:11
To: rthomp4521@btinternet.com
Cc: Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-

siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Marion Finlayson <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Dear Ralph

I want to start with extending my apologise to you on the time it has taken for the Task and Finish Group to get in contact with you. Over the past few months we have engaged within the group to identify conditions which we feel will enable the burial of fish waste under official supervision to be carried out at your site. I want to add that these conditions are not set in stone and open for discussion within reason:

Proposed burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk.
3. No pits left uncovered overnight, if pit has capacity left then predator net is firmly secured over the site – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept
4. Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site
5. Skips to be cleaned and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority
6. Only animal by-product waste from aquaculture from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received
7. Any disposal of animal by-product waste from aquaculture above background levels (event mortality) have to be pre-notified to Western Isles Council and the Scottish Government with quantities, origin location and disposal plan
8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated
9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced inspection

The Task and Finish Group would be happy to meet to discuss our thinking on these conditions. Let me know who should be included for a meeting and I will try to

arrange a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division |

Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
To: [Colm Fraser](#)
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste
Date: 25 November 2021 16:32:39
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Sorry Colm, I missed it. Poor mailbox management from going on leave last week. I'll have a chat with my colleagues but will probably wait to see what Mr Thompson says to these conditions.

From: Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 November 2021 16:15
To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste

Afternoon Iain

Did you get my email of 17th November?

Colm

--

Colm Fraser

Colm Friseal (Colm Fraser) | Manaidsear Seirbheisean Luchd-Cleachdaidh agus Arainneachd (Consumer and Environmental Services Manager)

[Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan](#) | [Comhairle nan Eilean Siar](#) | [Rathad Shanndabhaig](#) | [Steornabhagh](#) | [Eilean Leodhais](#) | [HS1 2BW](#)

Communities Department | [Comhairle nan Eilean Siar](#) | [Sandwick Road](#) | [Stornoway](#) | [Isle of Lewis](#) | [HS1 2BW](#)

cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk | [\[REDACTED\]](#) | [\[REDACTED\]](#) | www.cne-siar.gov.uk

Links to further service information:

[COVID](#)

[Trading Standards](#)

[Food Safety](#)

[Health and Safety at Work](#)

[Licensing](#)

[Animal Health & Welfare](#)

Consumer & Environmental Services welcomes your feedback. Please help us improve our service by taking our short customer survey at www.surveymonkey.com/s/cnes-ces-c

Ag Obair Comhla airson na h-Eileanan Siar **COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR** Working Together for the Western Isles



From: lan.Murdoch@gov.scot <lan.Murdoch@gov.scot>

Sent: 25 November 2021 16:11

To: rthomp4521@btinternet.com

Cc: Kenny MacLeod | G <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Marion Finlayson <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Maclean, Ruth <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; lan.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot

Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Dear Ralph

I want to start with extending my apologise to you on the time it has taken for the Task and Finish Group to get in contact with you. Over the past few months we have engaged within the group to identify conditions which we feel will enable the burial of fish waste under official supervision to be carried out at your site. I want to add that these conditions are not set in stone and open for discussion within reason:

Proposed burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk.
3. No pits left uncovered overnight, if pit has capacity left then predator net is firmly secured over the site – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept
4. Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site
5. Skips to be cleaned and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority
6. Only animal by-product waste from aquaculture from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received
7. Any disposal of animal by-product waste from aquaculture above background

levels (event mortality) have to be pre-notified to Western Isles Council and the Scottish Government with quantities, origin location and disposal plan

- 8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated
- 9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced inspection

The Task and Finish Group would be happy to meet to discuss our thinking on these conditions. Let me know who should be included for a meeting and I will try to arrange a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government

Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: rtomp4521@btinternet.com
To: [Ian Murdoch](mailto:Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot)
Cc: [Kenny MacLeod](mailto:Kenny.MacLeod@gov.scot) | [Colm Fraser](mailto:Colm.Fraser@gov.scot); [Lisa Johnson](mailto:Lisa.Johnson@gov.scot); [Marion Finlayson](mailto:Marion.Finlayson@gov.scot); Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; [Maclean, Ruth](mailto:Maclean.Ruth@gov.scot); Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.McDonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Subject: Re: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste
Date: 25 November 2021 17:03:18

Some people who received this message don't often get email from rtomp4521@btinternet.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Good evening Ian.

Nothing here that rings alarm bells although due to logistical / winter ground conditions/ administrative reasons a few of the items need discussed further to clarify our working practices.

I am available anytime over the next two weeks for a video call.

The numbers of mortalities will traditionally be very limited from now till May when the water temperature starts to rise again so this will help matters.

Everything is moving ahead well now with SEPA (since we employed a new consultant) and the engineers are also on schedule to get the plant fully installed.

Best regards

Ralph Thompson

On 25 Nov 2021, 16:11 +0000, Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot, wrote:

Dear Ralph I want to start with extending my apologise to you on the time it has taken for the Task and Finish Group to get in contact with you. Over the past few months we have engaged within the group to identify conditions which we feel will enable the burial of fish waste under official supervision to be carried out at your site. I want to add that these conditions are not set in stone and open for discussion within reason: Proposed burial conditions No burial above ground (no bunded pits) Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. No pits left uncovered overnight, if pit has capacity left then predator net is firmly secured over the site – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site Skips to be cleaned and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority Only animal by-product waste from aquaculture from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received Any disposal of animal by-product waste from aquaculture above background levels (event mortality) have to be pre-notified to Western Isles Council and the Scottish Government with quantities, origin location and disposal plan To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced inspection The Task and Finish Group would be happy to meet to discuss our thinking on these conditions. Let me know who should be included for a meeting and I will try to arrange a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks. Ian **Ian J Murdoch** Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

***** This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this

e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return. Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government. *****

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
To: rthomp4521@btinternet.com; [Kenny MacLeod I G](mailto:Kenny.MacLeod.I.G@scotland.nhs.uk); [Colm Fraser](mailto:Colm.Fraser@scotland.nhs.uk); [Lisa Johnson](mailto:Lisa.Johnson@scotland.nhs.uk); [Marion Finlayson](mailto:Marion.Finlayson@scotland.nhs.uk); Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; [Maclean, Ruth](mailto:Maclean.Ruth@scotland.nhs.uk); Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.McDonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Subject: RE: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste
Date: 30 November 2021 16:57:05

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Thanks Ralph

I have created a doodle poll looking for availability starting the w/b 6 December. Grateful if people could indicated their availability by the end of the week and we can get a virtual meeting set up.

https://doodle.com/poll/8wm5m4aic4vkm34p?utm_source=poll&utm_medium=link

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government
Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

From: rthomp4521@btinternet.com <rthomp4521@btinternet.com>
Sent: 25 November 2021 17:03
To: Murdoch I J (Ian) <Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot>
Cc: "kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk" <kennymacleod@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Colm Fraser <cfraser@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Lisa Johnson <lisa.johnson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; "mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk" <mfinlayson@cne-siar.gov.uk>; Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; "fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk" <fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk>; "ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk" <ruth.maclean@sepa.org.uk>; Ambrose N (Nick) Dr <Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot>; Mcdonald S (Samuel) <Samuel.McDonald@gov.scot>; Hastie IJL (Ian) <Ian.Hastie@gov.scot>; Miller R (Rebecca) <Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot>; King L (Lorna) <Lorna.King@gov.scot>
Subject: Re: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste

Good evening Ian.

Nothing here that rings alarm bells although due to logistical / winter ground conditions/ administrative reasons a few of the items need discussed further to clarify our working practices.

I am available anytime over the next two weeks for a video call.

The numbers of mortalities will traditionally be very limited from now till May when the water temperature starts to rise again so this will help matters.

Everything is moving ahead well now with SEPA (since we employed a new consultant) and the engineers are also on schedule to get the plant fully installed.

Best regards

Ralph Thompson
[REDACTED]

On 25 Nov 2021, 16:11 +0000, Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot, wrote:

Dear Ralph I want to start with extending my apologise to you on the time it has taken for the Task and Finish Group to get in contact with you. Over the past few months we have engaged within the group to identify conditions which we feel will enable the burial of fish waste under official supervision to be carried out at your site. I want to add that these conditions are not set in stone and open for discussion within reason: Proposed burial conditions No burial above ground (no bunded pits) Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk. No pits left uncovered overnight, if pit has capacity left then predator net is firmly secured over the site – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site Skips to be cleaned

and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority Only animal by-product waste from aquaculture from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received Any disposal of animal by-product waste from aquaculture above background levels (event mortality) have to be pre-notified to Western Isles Council and the Scottish Government with quantities, origin location and disposal plan To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced inspection The Task and Finish Group would be happy to meet to discuss our thinking on these conditions. Let me know who should be included for a meeting and I will try to arrange a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks. Ian **Ian J Murdoch**Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division | Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish GovernmentTel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]

***** This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return. Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.*****

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.
Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: rthomp4521@btinternet.com
To: [Kenny MacLeod I.G;](#) [Colm Fraser;](#) [Marion Finlayson;](#) [Donaldson, Fiona;](#) [Lorna.King@gov.scot;](mailto:Lorna.King@gov.scot) [Maclean, Ruth;](#) Ian.Hastie@gov.scot
Cc: [Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot;](mailto:Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot) [Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot;](mailto:Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot) Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: Re: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - draft meeting notes
Date: 16 December 2021 16:46:33

Some people who received this message don't often get email from rthomp4521@btinternet.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Good afternoon Ian

Ref: Proposed Derogation Conditions

Item 4. Please change to Lewis/ Harris.

Skye is outwith the CNES area.

Regards.

Ralph Thompson
[REDACTED]

On 16 Dec 2021, 14:52 +0000, Ian.Hastie@gov.scot, wrote:

Good afternoon everyone,

Thank you all for attending the Task and Finish Group Meeting on Monday the 13th of December.

Please see the attached document which covers the main topics discussed at the meeting including an update from Whiteshore Cockles Ltd, background to the Task and Finish Group, proposed burial derogation conditions and next steps/actions agreed.

Please can I ask you all to have a read of the notes and I invite you to send me any comments regarding the content.

If you have any questions or queries please let me know and I am also happy to discuss anything further with you should it be required.

Kind Regards

Ian Hastie

Policy Officer

Disease Prevention Team

Animal Health & Welfare Division

Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy

Scottish Government

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: Ian.Hastie@gov.scot
To: [Colm Fraser](#)
Cc: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
Subject: Request under the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (EIRs) for information
Date: 13 October 2022 12:28:56
Attachments: [Letter for consulting third parties - Comhairlie nan Eilean Siar.pdf](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Good afternoon,

The Scottish Government has received a request under the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (EIRs) for information on:

Whiteshore Cockles in North Uist - including photos, videos, Cabinet Briefings, letters, emails, correspondence with SEPA, Salmon Scotland, Mowi, Loch Duart, Bakkafrøst Scotland/The Scottish Salmon Company, CalMac, Western Isles Council, APHA and any other information since 12 November 2021.

Please see attached letter for your attention and please note the response deadline of 17 October 2022.

If you have any questions or queries please let me know.

Kind Regards

Ian Hastie
Policy Officer
Disease Prevention Team
Animal Health & Welfare Division
Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy
Scottish Government

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.
Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: Ian.Hastie@gov.scot
To: rthomp4521@btinternet.com; [Kenny MacLeod I.G](mailto:Kenny.MacLeod.I.G); [Colm Fraser](mailto:Colm.Fraser); [Marion Finlayson](mailto:Marion.Finlayson); fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; Lorna.King@gov.scot; [Maclean, Ruth](mailto:Maclean.Ruth)
Cc: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot
Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - burial waste conditions - draft meeting notes
Date: 16 December 2021 14:52:14
Attachments: [Task and Finish Group - meeting with WCL - notes - IM \(003\).docx](#)

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Good afternoon everyone,

Thank you all for attending the Task and Finish Group Meeting on Monday the 13th of December.

Please see the attached document which covers the main topics discussed at the meeting including an update from Whiteshore Cockles Ltd, background to the Task and Finish Group, proposed burial derogation conditions and next steps/actions agreed.

Please can I ask you all to have a read of the notes and I invite you to send me any comments regarding the content.

If you have any questions or queries please let me know and I am also happy to discuss anything further with you should it be required.

Kind Regards

Ian Hastie
Policy Officer
Disease Prevention Team
Animal Health & Welfare Division
Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy
Scottish Government

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: Ian.Murdoch@gov.scot
To: rthomp4521@btinternet.com
Cc: [Kenny MacLeod I.G.](mailto:Kenny.MacLeod.I.G;); [Colm Fraser](mailto:Colm.Fraser); [Lisa Johnson](mailto:Lisa.Johnson); [Marion Finlayson](mailto:Marion.Finlayson); Rui.Couchinho@apha.gov.uk; Michael.Park@apha.gov.uk; fiona.donaldson@sepa.org.uk; [Maclean, Ruth](mailto:Maclean.Ruth); Nick.Ambrose@gov.scot; Samuel.Mcdonald@gov.scot; Ian.Hastie@gov.scot; Rebecca.Miller@gov.scot; Lorna.King@gov.scot
Subject: Whiteshore Cockles - Task and Finish Group - future conditions for the burial of fish waste
Date: 25 November 2021 16:11:09

WARNING: THIS EMAIL CAME FROM OUTSIDE THE COMHAIRLE; PLEASE TREAT HYPERLINKS OR ATTACHMENTS WITH CAUTION. CONTACT THE IT HELPDESK IF IN ANY DOUBT.

Dear Ralph

I want to start with extending my apologise to you on the time it has taken for the Task and Finish Group to get in contact with you. Over the past few months we have engaged within the group to identify conditions which we feel will enable the burial of fish waste under official supervision to be carried out at your site. I want to add that these conditions are not set in stone and open for discussion within reason:

Proposed burial conditions

1. No burial above ground (no bunded pits)
2. Weekly list of morts detailing daily tonnage and origin sites to be emailed to eh@cne-siar.gov.uk.
3. No pits left uncovered overnight, if pit has capacity left then predator net is firmly secured over the site – records and daily time stamped photographic evidence to be kept
4. Animal by-product waste from aquaculture to be buried within 4 hours on arriving at site
5. Skips to be cleaned and disinfected immediately on emptying in accordance with cleaning schedule agreed in advance with competent authority
6. Only animal by-product waste from aquaculture from finfish farms operated by authorised Aquaculture Production Businesses and within the Western Isles Council planning authority area is received
7. Any disposal of animal by-product waste from aquaculture above background levels (event mortality) have to be pre-notified to Western Isles Council and the Scottish Government with quantities, origin location and disposal plan
8. To end on 31/03/22 – to be debated
9. The site will be subject to a weekly unannounced inspection

The Task and Finish Group would be happy to meet to discuss our thinking on

these conditions. Let me know who should be included for a meeting and I will try to arrange a virtual meeting over the next couple of weeks.

Ian

Ian J Murdoch

*Animal Health - Disease Prevention Team | Animal Health & Welfare Division |
Directorate for Agriculture & Rural Economy | Scottish Government
Tel. [REDACTED] | Mob: [REDACTED]*

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.
Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

From: [Anne Napier](#)
To: ["susan.macpherson@sepa.org.uk"](mailto:susan.macpherson@sepa.org.uk); [Patrick Hughes](#); [Colm Fraser](#); [Lisa Johnson](#)
Cc: [Morag Ferguson - Dev | G](#)
Subject: Whiteshores Cockles, Paible, North Uist
Date: 25 May 2022 16:07:23
Attachments: [20220513_PPC-A-5001983_AS_response_LA_consultee_comments.pdf](#)
[220503 - Consultee Response - LA.pdf](#)

Good afternoon

I am contacting you to share the response recently received from SEPA to the consultation comments submitted by the planning authority to the PPC Part A Permit application (both documents attached). In addition, the planning authority have yet to discharge conditions on the recent planning permissions granted, as the amount and type of information provided has not been satisfactory and, in some respects, differs significantly from the details provided as part of those applications.

In particular, rather than on-site treatment and discharge to the sea under a Marine Licence, as was previously proposed, it is currently proposed that waste would be removed from site by tanker, with 75% of the condensate effluent taken to the mainland for use in an anaerobic digester and 25% spread on Vallay.

The volume of waste involved would be significant. The Permit application estimates that a typical week's processing would yield 97,500 litres of condensate and proposes a 50,000 litres condensate storage tank on site (amongst other storage). The condensate would be removed in 25,000 litre collections by tanker. This removal would be in addition to the removal of fish oil, excess meal and wastewater, which would also be removed by tanker, for off-site use in anaerobic digesters or treatment.

We have concerns about the potential environmental impacts and community implications of such an approach, and its longer-term feasibility and viability. However, from the response provided by SEPA, some of these matters would not be within the control of the permitting process, but may be subject to other controls, such as an 'Exempt' activity under the WML process.

In light of this, having regard to the outstanding planning conditions requirements and as the PPC application moves to the next stage of assessment, we would find it very helpful to have a short Teams meeting with those that may be involved in different aspects of the overall process.

If you could you indicate your availability over the next 2-3 weeks, I will try to find a mutually convenient time and send a meeting invitation.

With thanks and kind regards

Anne

www.cne-siar.gov.uk

Anna Napier BA(Hons) MRTPI MIEMA CEnv | Oifigear Dealbhaidh | Roinn nan Coimhearsnachdan |
Comhairle nan Eilean Siar | Baile a' Mhanaich | Beinn na Faoghla | HS7 5LA | [REDACTED]

Covid-19 – Staff have moved to a hybrid working model. Email remains the best means of communication. I will be working from the office most Tuesdays and Thursdays.

Ag Obair Comhla airson na h-Eileanan Siar COMHAIRLE NAN EILEAN SIAR Working Together for the Western Isles

Planning applications and appeals can be submitted online at <https://www.eplanning.scot/ePlanningClient/>
Pre-application planning advice is given without prejudice to the consideration of any subsequent application received by Comhairle nan Eilean Siar.

British Sign Language (BSL) users can contact us directly by using [contactSCOTLAND-BSL](#)

