WILD TROUT TRUST

Tullaghobegly River

(Donegal)

June 2022

Author: Gareth Pedley (gpedley@wildtrout.org tel. 07500 870583)

Contents

Key Findings

- Poorly passable falls restrict access into the river, and then again to the upper reaches, but reasonable numbers of juvenile salmonids were observed in most areas visited, suggesting that the population is actively recruiting, at least in certain areas.

- The highest quality habitat observed on the river system was in the poorly accessible section upstream of Asnonomedan Waterfall and the Mowi Ireland fish farm, d/s of Lough Altan. Sadly, the area was significantly depleted by abstraction for the fish farm.

- Aside from the ethical question of such a large abstraction from the river for fish farming purposes, the poor-quality water discharge from the farm requires review, as it is currently creating a significant enrichment and a detrimental impact upon the river downstream, with sewage fungus visible over an extended length of channel. This appears to be captured by a drop in biological quality rating at the site downstream of the Mowi fish farm in 2021.

- Unnecessary bankside strimming and clearance in fished sections of the river was reducing riparian habitat quality and it would be beneficial to cease that action, thereby also saving time and effort that could be turned to habitat improvements.

- A general lack of trees and associated shade and low cover was observed in many sections. Buffer fencing to facilitate tree planting where livestock have access to the watercourse, and a general action of planting in other areas, would be beneficial.

- The dredging of pools is a damaging and counterproductive practice that should not be undertaken. The river should be allowed to create and maintain bed features via natural geomorphological processes. Any departure from the natural channel dimensions created by river flow will invariably be detrimental to habitat quality.

1. Introduction

The WTT was requested to undertake a suite of walkovers on the Ray River and Tullaghobegly River catchments, on behalf of Cloughaneely Angling Association and the Local Authority Waters Programme (LAWPRO), to assess current habitat conditions and make recommendations for improvement work that could be undertaken. This report covers the Tullaghobegly River catchment. Site visits were undertaken over three days (19-21/06/2022 inclusive) when river conditions were low and generally clear.

Normal convention is applied throughout this report with respect to bank identification, i.e. the banks are designated left bank (LB) or right bank (RB) whilst looking downstream. Specific locations are identified using latitude and longitude (decimal e.g. 54.45737, -1.306513), which can be pasted straight into Google Maps to identify exact locations. Cross-references to figure captions within the text of the report are hyperlinked, so holding Ctrl and left-clicking on them will move to the location of the figure within the document.

2. Background

Table 1 – Water Framework Directive waterbody overview

River	Tullaghobegly	Tullaghobegly
Waterbody Name	Tullaghobegly_10	Tullaghobegly_20
Waterbody ID	IE_NW_38T010100	TULLAGHOBEGLY_020
Catchment	Gweebarra-Sheephaven	Gweebarra-Sheephaven
River Basin District	North Western	North Western
Current Ecological Quality	Poor (At Risk)	Good
Length of river inspected (KM)	4.5	

https://catchments.ie/wp-content/files/subcatchmentassessments/38_6%20Tullaghobegly_SC_010%20Subcatchment%20Assessment%20WFD%20Cycle%202.pdf

In the Tullaghobegly_10 waterbody, a local authority section 4 licensed facility is suspected to be a significant pressure. It is understood by the author that this relates to the abstraction and discharge from the Mowi fish farm.

3. Habitat Assessment

Figure 1 (55.073055, -8.095563). The first section of river was walked from Lough Altan, where the outflow appeared to have been raised with a boulder impoundment. The substrate upstream in the lough and immediately downstream was smaller diameter gravel, suitable substrate for salmonid spawning. Gravel was relatively abundant in the first <80 metres d/s of Lough Altan, where the gradient was low; however, the gravel supply is only likely to be occurring in very high flow.

Figure 2. What appeared to be abstraction infrastructure was observed at the lough and several points down the river. It was not clear what aspects were still operational, but it is understood that the Mowi Ireland fish farm abstracts from the Lough, significantly depleting flow for the first ~1.5km of river d/s of the lough to the fish farm discharge. On the day of the visit, the fish farm discharge appeared to be greater in volume than the river on the day of the WTT visit (see Figure 16).

Figure 3. Following the WTT site visit, a photograph supplied by Cloughaneely AA (taken 18/08/2022), showed no flow passing over the boulder impoundment at the outflow of the lough (white ellipse), with the first section of the channel completely dry (and degraded for >50m of the first 80m of highest quality habitat d/s of the lough), and also creating a complete barrier to fish. At that time, what appeared to be a compensation discharge was occurring from the concrete infrastructure, but still left the impassable section and dry riverbed u/s.

Figure 4. Looking down the completely dry channel d/s of the lough (18/08/2022). The raised cobble/boulder impoundment that facilitates this abstraction will have also raised the level of the lough, drowning habitat at the mouth of the inlet streams and potentially impacting upon salmonid spawning areas. Any outlet spawning populations would also be affected, with juveniles inhibited (most of the time) and sometimes prevented (as on 18/08/2022) from re-entering the lough.

Figure 5. On the day of the WTT survey (with flow in the upper 50m of channel), where gravels were present, the river provided high quality habitat for salmonid spawning, invertebrates and potentially pearl mussels. Beds of aquatic macrophytes further enhanced habitat for juvenile salmonids and invertebrates. A large proportion of this higher quality habitat is lost when abstraction occurs at low flows (as on 18/08/2022).

Figure 6. With flow, the initial ~80m section of the river d/s of Lough Altan provided the highest quality habitat observed on the catchment, with a near absence of fine sediment or algae, owing to the effect of the lough u/s. This could be an important area for salmonid spawning and pearl mussels. Records of mussels here are limited, possibly in part due to intermittent fish access past the two major natural obstructions d/s, the lough outflow impoundment, artificially reduced flow through abstraction and drying of the upper section, but that doesn’t preclude the potential natural importance of the area to both fish and mussels.

Figure 7 (55.073513, -8.095903). A RB tributary appeared to supply elevated nutrients, with strings of algae hanging from the aquatic vegetation. There are no properties or infrastructure on the tributary, so the only likely impact is peat degradation from draining or grazing/sheep scarring. Inspection of aerial photography (Google Maps) appears to show deep scarring of the watercourse. Livestock exclusion, revegetation and planting would be beneficial.

Figure 8. Downstream of the tributary, the substrate was very different in appearance, with a significant coating of algae. Also note the change from a predominantly gravel bed to cobble and boulder. From this point d/s, the gradient increases for several hundred metres, where gravel greatly reduced. This was partially owing to the higher gradient, but also reduced/intermittent supply.

Figure 9 (55.075018, -8.097695). Herbicide appeared to have been sprayed on nettles alongside the water course. This should be undertaken very carefully and only by licensed operatives as it has the potential also to kill aquatic macrophytes within the water course. It would be far better to install fencing and leave an untreated buffer along the water course.

Figure 10 (55.075538, -8.098513). A section of the river had clearly been straightened, with a paleochannel evident in the adjacent field (dashed white line), removing the sinuosity of a valuable right-hand meander. Straightening shortens the water course, thereby increasing the gradient and reducing the potential to retain smaller gravel substrate in that area, which could otherwise provide additional spawning habitat. Reinstating this meander would improve the capacity of the area to support salmonids and pearl mussels.

Figure 11. The detrimental impact of the straightening was evident in the steepened channel d/s, where bed incision was clearly occurring, with a lack of deeper pools, undercutting of the banks and a coarse cobble substrate.

Figure 12. Downstream of the cut-off meander, where more bends remained, retention of gravel substrate suitable for salmonid spawning (and potentially pearl mussels) was again occurring. Even if access to this area is only possible for migratory salmonids in certain years, it could still preform a vital function in the long-term abundance of those populations, with high-quality habitat greatly benefiting the offspring of any fish that do gain access.

Figure 13 (55.078658, -8.099872). Extensive emergent vegetation growth at the outlet of Procklis Lough (a small, online lough) was almost certainly exacerbated by reduced flow down the channel, owing to the abstraction u/s, and potentially dredging/incision of the river channel d/s to drain the lough and surrounding land (see also Figure 14). This vegetation encroachment should be monitored as a series of low flow years could lead to further blockage, although it is to be hoped that high winter flows would ultimately maintain a free channel most winters.

Figure 14. Downstream of the lough, the river channel appeared to have been incised down into the bedrock, potentially to drain the area around the lough and reduce its size.

Figure 15. Inappropriate bank protection had been undertaken alongside the Mowi Ireland fish hatchery. It would be far better to have maintained a naturally vegetated and stable bank of appropriate size. The lack of diverse vegetation suggests that the bank is grazed. As that bank appeared inaccessible at either end, this may suggest livestock are crossing the river in very low flow, which could indicate further impact of the abstraction upon flows within the depleted reach.

Figure 16. The Mowi hatchery discharge appeared to be greater than the flow of the river at the time of inspection. In most scenarios, a Q95 hands-off flow (no abstraction allowed below the flow volume that is exceeded 95% of the time) is the standard protection afforded to watercourses, but seemingly not in this case, demonstrating one of the many environmental issues with the industry. Whatever the abstraction regime and accepting that the site is licensed for its abstraction and discharge, that water should naturally be in the river, improving habitat quality and abundance and assisting fish passage through the now depleted river reach.

Figure 17 (55.082712, -8.098777). Immediately d/s of the discharge, the detrimental impact of the incredibly poor quality, high-nutrient water discharge was evident, with sewage fungus growing on the riverbed (white circle).

Figure 18. A close-up of sewage fungus coating the substrate immediately d/s of the discharge point; this was the case for a significant length along the LB side of the river. In the most recent EPA assessment, the Tullaghobegly River suffered a decline in Biological Quality Rating (Q Value) from 4 (WFD Moderate in 2018) to 3 (WFD Status Poor in 2021) at the upper site, downstream of the MOWI fish farm. The lower site in Falcarragh remained at good quality (Q Value 4), presumably being sufficiently far d/s, with sufficient dilution and natural biological remediation occurring within the river. This does not detract from the issues of an extended reach of degraded river d/s of the fish farm.

Figure 19 (55.082587, -8.099862). The impact of sewage fungus could be seen for at least 80m d/s, coating areas of the bed, trailing vegetation and aquatic macrophytes. The impact of elevated algal growth on the substrate, aquatic and marginal vegetation extended for a significant distance.

Figure 20. The abundance and composition of the aquatic macrophyte communities changed d/s of the discharge, with starwort *Callitriche* sp. observed for the first time in great abundance, and an increase in the growth of pondweed of the *Potamogeton* genus (in addition to the sewage fungus and algae). The river changed in character through this reach too, becoming lower gradient and slower flowing, further assisting the colonisation of aquatic macrophytes, which dominated the channel and bound the substrate in many areas. This results in little potential for salmonid spawning. A significant increase in the fine sediment component of the riverbed was also observed through this area.

Figure 21 (55.083693, -8.101017). Bends and longer pool areas were present through this reach which provide some cover from water depth and overhanging vegetation along undercut banks, but the area generally lacked trees and shade. Tree planting would be beneficial throughout this area to provide shade, cover and food for invertebrates through leaf litter.

Figure 22 (55.088308, -8.100267). Asnonomedan Falls, a poorly passable bedrock outcrop, restricted fish access u/s, but trout and salmon are known to be naturally present u/s, indicating that it is passable in certain flows. Homing of escapee hatchery salmon above this point represents a potential issue for what is likely to be a small spawning population of fish u/s of the falls in most years.

Figure 23 (55.089522, -8.100158). A spot-check at the bridge ~100m d/s of the bridge revealed a well-established stand of Japanese knotweed; the first observed on the walkover. This highly invasive, non-native species should be eradicated with herbicide by a licensed operative before it spreads. The importance of tackling this issue quickly is heightened by the location, high up in the catchment, where it has the potential to spread for many miles d/s.

Figure 24. In many areas, the channel d/s of the bridge had been revetted to maintain it within an unnaturally straight channel. This greatly reduces the riverine habitat quality of those areas, increasing the gradient locally and preventing the development and maintenance of pool features, also increasing conveyance which can increase the energy of the river and reduces the potential to retain smaller gravel substrate.

Figure 25 (55.104593, -8.095445). A spot check was undertaken at the old railway crossing, where habitat u/s appeared to be good quality with well vegetated banks and occasional overhanging trees. Increasing the number of bankside trees through the reach u/s would be beneficial.

Figure 26 (55.104597, -8.095462). D/s, the RB was more manicured, with a corresponding reduction in habitat quality and a loss of overhanging and trailing vegetation. This reduced habitat quality for invertebrates and juvenile fish within the river margin.

Figure 27. Erosion of a high section of LB may appear detrimental, but further inspection revealed a rich seam of cobble and coarse gravel within the back toe. As an isolated occurrence (as opposed to long sections degraded by livestock), short sections of relatively natural erosion are beneficial in maintaining varied river habitat and substrate composition.

Figure 28 (55.105052, -8.097192). In general, there was a lack of bankside trees in this reach, something that could be easily addressed as the grazing pressure did not appear to be intense enough to prevent sapling growth on the LB, and the RB was recently buffer fenced. At strategic locations, live willow whips/cuttings could also be pushed into the bank toe to provide more low and overhanging cover. This would be highly beneficial on the outside bend of non-fishing banks.

Figure 29. In shallower areas, the growth of *Callitriche* sp. and/or algae was extensive, demonstrating a continued impact from enrichment u/s.

Figure 30. At one section of RB, the vegetation had been allowed to develop along the watercourse without being mown (white ellipse) and much higher quality riparian habitat was provided. This serves as a demonstration of how the bank should be better managed in other areas, maintaining only a narrow access path, set back from the river. In some areas, it may not even be necessary to maintain a track. A hands-off approach will pay dividends when managing the river and banks, undertaking only the minimum maintenance that is required for angler access and leaving in-channel trees and branches for cover (where they exist).

Figure 31 (55.10646, -8.098735). Beneficial tree planting work had been undertaken in several areas; however, being unguarded, some were already suffering from browsing pressure, presumably from deer. It may be beneficial to add tree guards in areas where browsing is observed to be an issue.

Figure 32 (55.107812, -8.099552). At several sections of RB, boulders had been used in a failed attempt to prevent erosion. Unfortunately, placing large boulders along a riverbank is more likely to <u>increase</u> erosion long term, as was already evident. Ideally, the riverbank would just be fenced further back to allow a better vegetated bank to stabilise, without the use of boulders. If necessary, brash bank protection could be used to protect the bank, but it is rarely required on fenced, well-vegetated bank. Dredging of the channel/pool downstream has probably exacerbated the erosion issue here too, by lowering the riverbed (Figure 34).

Figure 33. Drainage from an area of the LB land was supplying elevated levels of iron. While this may look alarming, as a limited occurrence like this, the ecological impact is likely to be minimal as the oxidised, ochre coloured iron precipitate is fairly inert. Note that the dilution within the river is such that the issue is only observable for a few metres; this will also be the case for any impact upon water quality.

Figure 34 (55.108552, -8.10066). Recent dredging work had been undertaken to a pool and adjacent bank presumably in an attempt to create more fish-holding water. However, the dimensions of a river channel are always dictated by the flow it receives. Deepening or widening will just increase the amount of sediment deposited there until the channel dimensions reduce back to a state of equilibrium, where the flow received can maintain the proportions through scour at high flow.

Figure 35 (55.121302, -8.106115). A spot-check was undertaken at Big Bridge, where the footings create a small obstruction to fish movement. They should be passable with a bit of extra water, but may form a behavioural barrier, particularly for salmon, with sea trout more likely to pass small obstructions in lower flows. Partial-width baffles (white blocks in Figure 33) could be installed in of one of the bridge spans, maintaining a bed-depth notch of at least 40cm width at alternating sides, to dissipate flow energy, increase water depth and improve passability. While this is a relatively low priority, it could improve low-flow passability and assist fish to move u/s.

Figure 36 (55.121378, -8.105792). D/s of the bridge, a good pool was degraded by a line of boulders alongside outside bend (white ellipse), limiting access to overhanging cover, where fish would choose to lie. One or two individual, well-spaced boulders could provide lies, but these multiple structures simply prevent flow passing around the outside bend and valuable overhead cover.

Figure 37 (55.121687, -8.10623). As with other areas, the strimming observed was counterproductive to the preservation of high-quality riparian habitat and it would be far better to leave bankside area uncut. Overhanging willows on the far RB provide some good cover alongside juvenile habitat. It would be beneficial to transplant some cuttings across onto the opposite LB to provide more cover and bank stability there.

Figure 38 (55.135412, -8.117067). The final area visited was between the N56 road bridge and the tidal limit. U/s of the bridge, the bank maintenance should be reduced. Habitat along the LB (right of shot) could be greatly improved by establishing several feature trees to provide shade and cover and hold more fish.

Figure 39 (55.13565, -8.117325). The N56 bridge footings provide a slightly more problematic obstruction but access had been somewhat eased by the installation of a small weir/pre-barrage d/s. This would be a more traditional method to ease fish passage, however, the weir itself also creates an obstruction that - although passable - is likely to be a behavioural barrier in extremes of temperature and certain flows. It is better than nothing, but the ideal solution would be a more natural ramp of cobble and boulders grading out the step from the bridge footings to the riverbed d/s. It may be that this is the case within the impounded pool u/s and the weir could be removed, but this was not possible to ascertain without further inspection.

Figure 40. Habitat within the lower section was generally good, greatly enhanced by overhanging boughs and vegetation along the far, RB.

Figure 41 (55.136085, -8.120538). Just u/s from the tidal limit, major bedrock outcrops create a series of falls, the largest only being passable in higher flows and certainly a major barrier to salmon and sea trout in most flows. However, it is a natural feature and as such, requires no action. Reasonable numbers (>100 each year) of salmon and sea trout are reportedly caught u/s of here (C. Gallagher, pers. comm., 21st June 2022).

Figure 42 (55.136085, -8.121203). A large bedrock pool d/s of the falls marked the upper extent of the tide and provided a valuable resting area for fish entering the estuary and lower river, whether they manage to run the river or not, the latter being a real potential issue in low flow years and almost certainly contributing to annual fluctuations in salmon and sea trout runs and catches u/s.

4. Recommendations

The scoring priority takes into account the ease of initiating the recommendation, not just the severity of the issue, so simple, easily achievable improvements may score as highly as major, important to address issues.

Observation	**Recommendation**	**Priority 1-3**	**Coordinates (Lat/Long)**
Figure 1. Raised bed at outflow to Lough Altan	Ideally, the raised rock overspill from the lough should be removed to: • Reinstate a natural outflow and regular gravel supply to the river • Facilitate outlet spawning • Restore habitat at the mouths of inlet streams where they enter the lough	1	55.073055, -8.095563
Figure 3. Drying of the outflow to Lough Altan and creation of a complete barrier.	• A hands off flow (HOF) should be applied to the Tullaghobegly River (Lough Altan), as is best practice for all watercourses, whereby a natural, continual flow from the lough is always maintained to the river (along with fish passage) • Undertake exhaustive salmon pearl mussel surveys within the depleted reach d/s of Lough Altan to ascertain whether they are present and, therefore, whether the abstraction is creating a potential impact upon those species within some of the best habitat on the river	1	55.073055, -8.095563

Observation	Recommendation	Priority 1-3	Coordinates (Lat/Long)
Figure 7. Small RB tributary supplying elevated levels of nutrients	Owing to the potential value of the main river habitat here, it would be worth investigating options to fence, revegetate and plant trees along the tributary	1/2	55.073513, -8.095903
Figure 9. Herbicide use along watercourse	• Maintain an unsprayed buffer along the watercourse. • Install a buffer fence	2	55.075018, -8.097695
Figure 10. Channel straightening	Channel restoration to reinstate the meander	1	55.075538, -8.098513
Figure 13. Emergent vegetation choking the outflow from Procklis Lough	Occasional inspection of the outflow to ensure it remains easily passable	2	55.078658, -8.099872
Figure 17. Highly polluting discharge from the Mowi Ireland salmon farm	• Seek further inspection and testing of the discharge • If the discharge is within its operating conditions, seek revision of those conditions to protect the water quality and habitat of the river (along with the dependent species) • Seek further, more effective treatment of the effluent from the Mowi fish farm	1	55.082712, -8.098777
Figure 21. Lack of trees/cover	• Undertake planting with native broadleaf species • Undertake strategic planting with willow whips/cuttings to provide cover features	2	55.083693, -8.101017

Observation	Recommendation	Priority 1-3	Coordinates (Lat/Long)
Figure 23. Japanese knotweed	Treatment with herbicide by licensed operative	1	55.089522, -8.100158
Figure 25. Lack of trees	• Undertake planting with native broadleaf species • Undertake strategic planting with willow whips/cuttings to provide cover features	3	55.104593, -8.095445
Figure 26. Over-maintained riverbanks	• Allow an uncut buffer along the watercourse • Where necessary, maintain a small access track set well back from the river This is a high priority as it is so easy to achieve, for significant benefit	1	55.104597, -8.095462
Figure 28. Lack of trees	• Undertake planting with native broadleaf species • Undertake strategic planting with willow whips/cuttings to provide cover features	2	55.105052, -8.097192
Figure 31. Browsing of planted saplings	Install tree guards	2	55.10646, -8.098735
Figure 32 & Figure 33. Boulder revetment of the bank and dredging d/s	• Avoid the use of large, hard structures as bank protection • Maintain a wide, well-vegetated buffer along the watercourse • Install brash bank protection if absolutely necessary • Cease dredging of the channel	1	55.107812, -8.099552

Observation	Recommendation	Priority 1-3	Coordinates (Lat/Long)
Figure 35. Small obstruction at Big Bridge footings	• Install partial-width baffles on alternating sides of one or other bridge span	2	55.121302, -8.106115
Figure 36. Boulders inhibiting flow around the outside bend	• Carefully remove all except one or two, well-spaced boulders • The removed boulders could be distributed well away from each other within the channel. Advice should be sought on the placing, to avoid creation of erosion issues or inhibition of natural geomorphological processes	2	55.121378, -8.105792
Figure 37. Over-maintained riverbanks	• Allow an uncut buffer along the watercourse • Where necessary, maintain a small access track set well back from the river • Plant willows in LB This is a high priority as it is so easy to achieve, for significant benefit	1	55.121687, -8.10623
Figure 38. Over-maintained riverbanks	• Allow an uncut buffer along the watercourse • Where necessary, maintain a small access track set well back from the river • Plant willows in LB This is a high priority as it is so easy to achieve, for significant benefit	1	55.135412, -8.117067

Observation	Recommendation	Priority 1-3	Coordinates (Lat/Long)
Figure 39. Weir/pre-barrage to bridge footings	Further investigation as to whether the bridge footings already form a gradual rock ramp or would create a significantly perched step without the weir. If they would form a gradually graded feature, the weir could be removed.	2	55.13565, -8.117325

On upland catchments like the Ray and Tullaghobegly, installing buffer fencing/livestock exclusion for the watercourse is always going to be a high priority recommendation, along with maintaining any existing fences.
This kind of natural in-channel structure can also, ultimately, help to restore the dimensions of a channel by enhancing areas of scour and deposition.

It would also be beneficial to campaign more widely for reduced grazing pressure on the upland areas of the catchment, to reduce the impacts of increased erosion and incision of the peat that is occurring. Similarly, far more could be done to protect the river from peat infiltration by ensuring that cutting and drainage of the peat is limited (prevented ideally) and any water drained from the peat is attenuated in soak-aways, rather than being allowed directly back to any watercourses.

The raised outflow structure and drying of the outflow to Lough Altan, with significant depletion of flow in the upper reaches of the Tullaghobegly River and reduction in coarse sediment supply, greatly degrades the riverine habitat, with a significant negative impact upon salmonid, and possibly and pearl mussel (if present), habitat. Pearl mussel surveys would be valuable to ascertain if they are present, or whether the negative impact is limited to the salmonids, invertebrates and macrophytes inhabiting the reach. Further information on the abstraction from Lough Altan and potential impact upon flows can be found in the **Cloughaneely Angling Association - Tullaghobegly and Ray River Catchments Management Plan 2018 – 2021 (Published February 2018) – Section 2.6**.

5. Further assistance

The WTT may be able to offer further assistance such as:

- Further walkovers

  The WTT can undertake further investigation of the tributaries not covered by the report.

  Assistance installing LWM as workshops or practical days.

  Assistance in planning or delivering any river restoration projects.

The WTT website library has a wide range of free materials in video and PDF format on habitat management and improvement:

www.wildtrout.org/content/wtt-publications

We have also produced a 70-minute DVD called 'Rivers: Working for Wild Trout' which graphically illustrates the challenges of managing river habitat for wild trout, with examples of good and poor habitat and practical demonstrations of habitat improvement. Additional sections of film cover key topics in greater depth, such as woody debris, enhancing fish populations and managing invasive species.

The DVD is available to buy for £10.00 from our website shop www.wildtrout.org/shop/products/rivers-working-for-wild-trout-dvd or by calling the WTT office on 02392 570985.

6. Acknowledgements

The WTT would like to thank LAWPRO for providing the funding for these walkovers

7. Disclaimer

This report is produced for guidance; no liability or responsibility for any loss or damage can be accepted by the Wild Trout Trust as a result of any other person, company or organisation acting, or refraining from acting upon guidance made in this report.

Legal permissions must be sought before commencing work on site. These are not limited to landowner permissions but will also involve regulatory authorities and any other relevant bodies or stakeholders. Alongside permissions, risk assessment and adhering to health and safety legislation and guidance is also an essential component of any interventions or activities in and around your fishery.