

# Appendix 22.4 eDNA Survey Report

# **Environmental Statement Volume 3**

Applicant: East Anglia ONE North Limited

Document Reference: 6.3.22.4

SPR Reference: EA1N-DWF-ENV-REP-IBR-000359\_004 Rev 01

Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(a)

Author: Royal HaskoningDHV

Date: October 2019 Revision: Version 1





| Revision Summary |   |                |            |              |  |
|------------------|---|----------------|------------|--------------|--|
| Rev              | Date Prepared by Checked by Approved by |                |            |              |  |
| 01               | 08/10/2019                              | Paolo Pizzolla | lan Mackay | Helen Walker |  |

| Description of Revisions |      |         |                      |
|--------------------------|------|---------|----------------------|
| Rev                      | Page | Section | Description          |
| 01                       | n/a  | n/a     | Final for Submission |





# **Table of Contents**

| 22.4 | eDNA Survey Report              | 1  |
|------|---------------------------------|----|
| 22.1 | Introduction                    | 1  |
| 22.2 | Project Background              | 1  |
| 22.3 | Legislation                     | 1  |
| 22.4 | Methodology                     | 2  |
| 22.5 | Results                         | 4  |
| 22.6 | Conclusions and Recommendations | 9  |
| 22.7 | References                      | 11 |

Appendix 22.4 is additionally supported by:

Annex 1: eDNA result report

Annex 2: Figures 22.4.1 and 22.4.2





## Appendix 22.4 is supported by the figures listed below.

| Figure<br>Number | Title                    |
|------------------|--------------------------|
| Figure 22.4.1    | Waterbody Locations      |
| Figure 22.4.2    | Waterbody Survey Results |

## Appendix 22.4 is supported by the tables listed below.

| Table Number | Title                          |
|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Table A22.1  | Summary of Pond HSI Assessment |
| Table A22.2  | Summary of Pond eDNA Survey    |





# Glossary of Acronyms

| EcIA     | Ecological impact Assessment                  |  |
|----------|---|--|
| eDNA     | Environmental DNA                             |  |
| EPS      | European Protected Species                    |  |
| EPSML    | European Protected Species Mitigation Licence |  |
| ES       | Environmental Statement                       |  |
| ETG      | Expert Topic Group                            |  |
| HRA      | Habitats Regulations Assessment               |  |
| HSI      | Habitat Suitability Index                     |  |
| JNCC     | Joint Nature Conservation Committee           |  |
| km       | Kilometers                                    |  |
| m        | Metres  |  |
| NERC Act | Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act |  |





# Glossary of Terminology

| Applicant                              | East Anglia ONE North Limited.  |  |
|--|---|--|
| Development area                       | The area comprising the onshore development area and the offshore development area (described as the 'order limits' within the Development Consent Order).  |  |
| East Anglia ONE<br>North project       | The proposed project consisting of up to 67 wind turbines, up to four offshore electrical platforms, up to one construction, operation and maintenance platform, inter-array cables, platform link cables, up to one operational meteorological mast, up to two offshore export cables, fibre optic cables, landfall infrastructure, onshore cables and ducts, onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure.                                |  |
| East Anglia ONE<br>North windfarm site | The offshore area within which wind turbines and offshore platforms will be located.  |  |
| European site                          | Sites designated for nature conservation under the <u>Habitats Directive</u> and <u>Birds Directive</u> , as defined in regulation 8 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and regulation 18 of the Conservation of Offshore Marine Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These include candidate Special Areas of Conservation, Sites of Community Importance, Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas. |  |
| Landfall                               | The area (from Mean Low Water Springs) where the offshore export cables would make contact with land, and connect to the onshore cables.  |  |
| Mitigation areas                       | Areas captured within the onshore Development Area specifically for mitigating expected or anticipated impacts.   |  |
| Natura 2000 site                       | A site forming part of the network of sites made up of Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas designated respectively under the Habitats Directive and Birds Directive.   |  |
| Onshore cable corridor                 | The corridor within which the onshore cable route will be located.  |  |
| Onshore cable route                    | This is the construction swathe within the onshore cable corridor which would contain onshore cables as well as temporary ground required for construction which includes cable trenches, haul road and spoil storage areas.  |  |
| Onshore cables                         | The cables which would bring electricity from landfall to the onshore substation. The onshore cable is comprised of up to six power cables (which may be laid directly within a trench, or laid in cable ducts or protective covers), up to two fibre optic cables and up to two distributed temperature sensing cables.  |  |
| Onshore development area               | The area in which the landfall, onshore cable corridor, onshore substation, landscaping and ecological mitigation areas, temporary construction facilities (such as access roads and construction consolidation sites), and the National Grid Infrastructure will be located.   |  |



# 22.4 eDNA Survey Report

#### 22.1 Introduction

1. This report describes the approach and findings of great crested newt *Triturus* cristatus surveys undertaken by Royal HaskoningDHV ecologists in support of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project.

#### 22.2 Project Background

- 2. A subsequent Phase 1 Habitat Survey (Phase 1 Addendum) was conducted in response to Section 42 consultation in March 2019. The purpose of this additional survey was to gather habitat information from the small western portion of the onshore development area which was not obtained during the initial 2018 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey. Further detail and the results of this Phase 1 Addendum are presented in Annex 1 of *Appendix 22.3*. The 2019 Phase 1 Addendum identified no water bodies assessed as suitable to support great crested newts.
- 3. Therefore, the results of the great crested newt surveys are informed by the 2018 Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey alone. However, the results presented in this appendix are relevant to the great crested newt survey area which is shown on *Figures 22.4.1* and *22.4.2*. The onshore development area is shown on *Figures 22.4.1* and *22.4.2* as the solid red line for reference.

## 22.3 Legislation

- 4. The great crested newt is listed under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). This legislation, when taken together, results in a level of protection that prohibits the intentional, deliberate or reckless:
  - Killing, injuring, taking or disturbance of great crested newts;
  - Damaging, destroying or obstructing any place used by great crested newts for the purposes of breeding, sheltering or protection; and
  - Selling and/or advertising for sale a great crested newt or any part thereof.
- 5. The great crested newt is listed as a species of principal importance for nature conservation in England in accordance with Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006. Section 40 of the same Act requires that local and regional authorities have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England, when carrying out their normal functions.



#### 22.4 Methodology

- 6. The scope of works for the 2018 onshore great crested newt survey was as follows:
  - Identify all ponds within the onshore study area (i.e. the onshore great crested newt survey area);
  - Complete Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) assessment of all potentially suitable ponds within the onshore great crested newt survey area to indicate their likely suitability for great crested newts; and
  - Undertake eDNA survey of all ponds with potential to support great crested newts in the onshore great crested newt survey area to determine likely presence or absence.
- 7. The methods and results of the great crested newt survey are reported in this appendix, along with an evaluation of the results to inform the subsequent Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA). Due to the limitations associated with the eDNA method it was not possible to collect data on other species of amphibian during the survey (see **section 22.4.3**), so the remit of this report is restricted to great crested newt and other species of amphibian are not considered further.

#### 22.4.1 Habitat Suitability (HSI Assessment)

- 8. A total of 38 potentially suitable water bodies (ponds and watercourses) were identified within the onshore great crested newt survey area (*Figure 22.4.1a 22.4.1f*). All 38 of these waterbodies were assessed for their potential to support great crested newt using the HSI in accordance with standard methodology (Oldham et al., 2000). These HSI assessments were undertaken during in May and June 2018.
- 9. The HSI assessment considers the following ten habitat attributes that are considered to influence the suitability of a pond for breeding great crested newts:
  - Location within a UK-wide context reflecting the differences in national distribution of this species;
  - Area water bodies between 100m² and 300m² in size are considered to represent the most suitable habitat for great crested newt;
  - Drying the number of years in which a pond dries over a ten-year period.
     Occasional drying kills fish which is beneficial for great crested newt, but the species predominantly favours ponds that do not dry out every year;
  - Water quality qualitative evidence-based assessment to infer good (diverse aquatic invertebrate assemblage), moderate (moderate

#### **Environmental Statement**



- invertebrate diversity), poor (low invertebrate diversity, few submerged plants) or bad (clearly polluted) water quality;
- Shade percentage of pond perimeter shaded to at least 1m from the shore.
   Great crested newt favour lightly shaded water bodies;
- Waterfowl qualitative evidence-based assessment of presence or absence and numbers is made. Large numbers of waterfowl can result in nutrient enrichment of the water and habitat damage, which is less favourable for great crested newt;
- Fish qualitative evidence-based assessment of likely presence or absence is made. Great crested newt favour breeding ponds that do not support fish because their open-water swimming larvae are vulnerable to fish predation; and
- Number of waterbodies within 1 km great crested newt populations are typically best developed where they have access to a network of ponds, and therefore the species is more likely to be found where there are several ponds within 1 km that are linked by suitable terrestrial habitat; and macrophyte cover – percentage of pond surface area occupied by macrophyte cover. Female great crested newts require aquatic vegetation for egg-laying.

#### 22.4.2 eDNA Survey

- 10. Water samples were collected by Royal HaskoningDHV great crested newt licenced ecologists from all water bodies where landowner permission had been granted on the 30<sup>th</sup> May, 31<sup>st</sup> May and 29<sup>th</sup> June 2018. Each sample was then sent to Fera Science Solutions (FERA) for analysis for eDNA in accordance with approved field and laboratory protocols (Briggs et al., 2014). Water bodies were not entered by surveyors during sample collection, and new sterile equipment supplied by FERA was used to collect each water sample, to prevent contamination between samples.
- 11. The presence or absence of great crested newt from each of the surveyed water bodies was determined based on the results of the eDNA analysis. If eDNA is detected this provides confirmation of presence and the relevant water bodies are likely to require further assessment If eDNA is not detected then this provides high confidence that there is no reasonable likelihood of great crested newt being present in the relevant water bodies, and they require no further assessment with regards to this species. This is an approved valid method for great crested newt presence/absence survey and this approach was agreed with stakeholders at the Expert Topic Group (ETG) meeting in April 2018.





#### 22.4.3 Survey Limitations

- Surveys using the eDNA method have a benefit over traditional surveys in that 12. they can be validly completed within a single visit to each relevant water body between mid-May and the end of June. Therefore, they can be programmed and completed later in the newt survey season when surveys using traditional methods are not possible. However, the eDNA sampling technique does not enable an estimate of population size class; rather it provides confirmation of presence or likely absence of great crested newts in the water body concerned. In addition, the method cannot currently be used to record the presence or absence of other species of amphibian present in the surveyed water bodies. In some circumstances, further survey is needed to allow estimation of the population size class, particularly where a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) may subsequently need to be obtained. However, for the purposes of this report consideration of the geographic location and relative distance of the only pond testing positive for great crested newt, population size class data is not relevant and no further survey work is necessary at this time. Therefore, reliance entirely on the result of eDNA survey is not a limitation to the current assessment presented in this report. The available data is sufficient to determine the consequences of the proposed East Anglia ONE North project for great crested newt.
- 13. Based on Natural England's standing advice on great crested newts, the window for collecting eDNA samples is 15<sup>th</sup> April to 30<sup>th</sup> June. All the eDNA samples were collected during this period and therefore are compliant with the eDNA methodology and analysis.
- 14. Only 32 of the 38 waterbodies had been granted landowner permission. Therefore, the remaining six waterbodies that were not accessed and therefore not surveyed in 2018 will be subject to future survey(s) once landowner permission has been obtained (dependent upon the results of the HSI assessment).

#### 22.5 Results

#### **22.5.1 2018 HSI Assessment**

15. All 38 waterbodies identified to be within the onshore great crested newt survey area were subject to a HSI assessment. Of the 38 waterbodies assessed, 10 were noted as being dry and therefore scoped out from any further survey. The remaining 28 were therefore subject to an eDNA survey. However, five of these 28 waterbodies were not granted landowner access and consequently were not subject to an eDNA survey. The remaining 23 waterbodies were granted landowner access and where therefore subject to an eDNA survey.





16. The results of the HSI assessments for all 38 waterbodies is summarised in *Table A22.1* below, and their locations are shown on *Figure 22.4.1a -22.4.1f*.

Table A22.1 Summary of Pond HSI Assessment

| Table A22.1 Summary of Pond HSI Assessment |  |           |   |  |
|--|--|-----------|---|--|
| Water body<br>(Pond)<br>Reference          | Pond Type  | HSI Score | Scoped into<br>eDNA<br>survey<br>(yes/no) |  |
| 160  | Small waterbody located within a corner of two arable fields and busy road. Oak, alder, hawthorn and dogs mercury present. No macrophytes present.   | 0.35      | Yes but no access granted                 |  |
| 140  | Medium sized waterbody within a corner of an arable field. Connected to a dry ditch network. Hawthorn, common nettle, primrose, common hogweed and grass species present. Dogs mercury and common reed also present.                               | 0.81      | Yes                                       |  |
| 134  | Medium sized waterbody within a residential garden. Hawthorn, goat willow, daffodils, primrose, common reed, broadleaved dock, water milfoil and soft rush present.  | 0.48      | Yes but no access granted                 |  |
| 133  | Small waterbody within residential garden. Ash, goat willow and hawthorn present. No egg laying material noted and banks are steep sided. Daffodils, broadleaved dock and spear thistle also noted.  | 0.46      | Yes but no access granted                 |  |
| 135  | Medium sized waterbody within residential garden next to arable fields. Waterbody is located within a grassland area surrounded by trees. Species include hawthorn and goat willow. Common reed and duckweed also present. Steep sided banks.      | 0.51      | Yes                                       |  |
| TN288                                      | Waterbody (ditch) located between arable fields.<br>Noted to be predominately dry at the time of the<br>survey with steep sided banks.   | 0.82      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |  |
| TN289                                      | Waterbody (ditch) located between arable fields. Noted to be predominately dry at the time of the survey with steep sided banks.   | 0.82      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |  |
| 143  | Waterbody (ditch) running around farmhouse and garden. Waterbody is fenced with steep sided banks. No egg laying material present.   | 0.48      | Yes but no access granted                 |  |
| 152  | Small waterbody within a residential garden with steep sided concrete banks. Oak, hawthorn, lesser celandine, common dog violet, common hogweed, common nettle and primrose also present. Appears to be part of an old mill pond and ditch system. | 0.72      | Yes                                       |  |
| 139  | Medium sized waterbody in arable field that is fenced off by trees, pheasant feeders and hides   | 0.81      | Yes                                       |  |





| Water body<br>(Pond)<br>Reference | Pond Type   | HSI Score | Scoped into<br>eDNA<br>survey<br>(yes/no) |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------|---|
|                                   | also present. Goat willow, ash, hawthorn, common hogweed, common nettle, bramble, broadleaved dock and primrose also present.   |           |   |
| 153                               | Small heart shaped waterbody within corner of arable field with steep banks. Pipe inlet present with limited macrophytes. Scrub areas present.  | 0.50      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 114                               | Long waterbody at edge of woodland. Leaf litter and large woody debris present. Absence of suitable egg laying material. Ground flora is limited to bramble and hogweed. Trees are predominately oak and sycamore interspersed with hawthorn. | 0.62      | Yes                                       |
| 113                               | Connected to Pond 114 and therefore similar waterbody description.  | 0.57      | Yes                                       |
| 115                               | Connected to Pond 114 and therefore similar waterbody description.  | 0.62      | Yes                                       |
| 112                               | Medium sized waterbody in residential garden. Common reed present. Concrete wall surrounding waterbody with fish also present.  | 0.32      | Yes                                       |
| 123                               | Connected to Pond 114 and therefore similar waterbody description.  | 0.62      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 125                               | Connected to Pond 114 and therefore similar waterbody description.  | 0.62      | Yes                                       |
| 124                               | Connected to Pond 114 and therefore similar waterbody description.  | 0.62      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 117                               | Waterbody with shallow banks and partially fenced. Goat willow, bramble, daffodils and common nettle also present.  | 0.39      | Yes                                       |
| 120                               | Small waterbody within a woodland with a large amount of woody debris noted. Small area of water mint also present.   | 0.44      | Yes                                       |
| 118                               | Elongated waterbody noted to be partially dry at the time of the survey.  | 0.38      | Yes                                       |
| 119                               | Elongated waterbody noted to be partially dry at the time of the survey.  | 0.38      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 137                               | Small waterbody at edge of arable field and surrounded by semi-improved grassland. Oak,   | 0.55      | Yes                                       |





| Water body<br>(Pond)<br>Reference | Pond Type  | HSI Score | Scoped into<br>eDNA<br>survey<br>(yes/no) |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|---|
|                                   | hawthorn, bramble, common hogweed and common nettle also present.  |           |   |
| 73                                | Waterbody within arable field and appeared to be subject to flooding. Surrounding vegetation consists of willow, bramble and dandelions.   | 0.60      | Yes                                       |
| NP3                               | Small pond within a deep depression within centre of arable field. Steep sided and access only possible from the northern end of the waterbody. Horse chestnut, hawthorn, oak, bramble, thistle, daffodils, common nettle, curled dock and cow parsley present around waterbody. | 0.54      | No - dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| NP2                               | Small pond in corner of arable field and located within an area of marshy grassland. Grey willow, broadleaved dock and grass species present.  | 0.59      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 86                                | Small waterbody on the edge of heathland surrounded by semi-improved grassland. Willow, broadleaved dock, oak, white clover, red dead nettle, lovage and watercress is present.  Duckweed also present.  | 0.88      | Yes but no access granted                 |
| NP1                               | Small waterbody within a wooded depression between two arable fields. Water quality observed to be very poor with surrounding vegetation predominately bracken, bramble, common nettle, oak and white willow.  | 0.39      | Yes                                       |
| 2                                 | Medium sized man-made waterbody that is concrete lined and located within residential property. Owner advised that goldfish are present. No macrophytes present and waterbody is surrounded by grassland that is regularly mown with limited herb species present.               | 0.49      | Yes but no<br>access<br>granted           |
| 3                                 | Small pond in residential garden. Waterbody is located within area of short grass.   | 0.48      | Yes                                       |
| 6                                 | Medium sized waterbody in agricultural field (in crop with beetroot). No shade around waterbody with common reed present. Water quality noted as being poor and subject to regular run-off from agricultural field.  | 0.51      | Yes                                       |
| 158                               | Small waterbody within a depression within a woodland. Appears to be dry at times with a lack of surrounding terrestrial habitat.  | 0.21      | Yes                                       |
| 4                                 | Ephemeral waterbody within arable field. Shallow waterbody noted to be drying at the time of the survey. Poor water quality noted.   | 0.29      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |



| Water body<br>(Pond)<br>Reference | Pond Type  | HSI Score | Scoped into<br>eDNA<br>survey<br>(yes/no) |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------|---|
| 9                                 | Medium sized waterbody within a field depression. Water quality noted to be extremely poor with silty substrate. Hawthorn, bracken, bramble, grass species and reeds also present.                                   | 0.34      | Yes                                       |
| 15                                | Ditch running through woodland with a sluggish flow. Steep banks present with no emergent vegetation or bankside vegetation.   | 0.58      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 7                                 | Small "puddle" in arable field with approximately 10cm of water at the time of the survey. No macrophytes present and appeared to experience dryness at times.   | 0.45      | No – Dry at<br>time of<br>survey          |
| 18                                | Large pond within golf course. Bulrush and common reed present with areas of scrub around edges. Silver birch present. Surrounding habitat is regularly used by golfers but waterbody is connected to wider habitat. | 0.52      | Yes                                       |
| 19                                | Pond adjacent to golf course within woodland.<br>Mainly oak, bramble, bracken, nettle and common<br>reed present.  | 0.67      | Yes                                       |

#### 22.5.2 eDNA Survey

17. Of the 28 ponds scoped into requiring an eDNA survey, five were not granted access and therefore only 23 ponds were subject to the 2018 eDNA survey effort. Three of these ponds returned a positive result for great crested newt, these are highlighted in the table below. The full eDNA results from the laboratory are provided in Annex 1 of this report and are summarised in *Table A22.2* below.

Table A22.2 Summary of Pond eDNA Survey

| Water body<br>(Pond) Reference | eDNA Positive for GCN? | FERA reference |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 140                            | Negative               | S18-004115     |
| 135                            | Positive               | S18-004091     |
| 152                            | Positive               | S18-004122     |
| 139                            | Negative               | S18-004120     |
| 114                            | Negative               | S18-004118     |
| 113                            | Negative               | S18-004121     |
| 115                            | Negative               | S18-004123     |



| Water body<br>(Pond) Reference | eDNA Positive for GCN? | FERA reference |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 112                            | Negative               | S18-004114     |
| 125                            | Negative               | S18-004117     |
| 117                            | Positive               | S18-004124     |
| 120                            | Negative               | S18-004116     |
| 118                            | Negative               | S18-004127     |
| 137                            | Negative               | S18-004119     |
| 73                             | Negative               | S18-004129     |
| NP1                            | Negative               | S18-004125     |
| 3                              | Negative               | S18-004128     |
| 6                              | Negative               | S18-004131     |
| 158                            | Negative               | S18-004132     |
| 9                              | Negative               | S18-004093     |
| 18                             | Negative               | S18-004073     |
| 19                             | Negative               | S18-004076     |

#### 22.6 Conclusions and Recommendations

- 18. Three of the 21 ponds subject to the eDNA survey returned a positive result for great crested newts, namely:
  - Pond 135;
  - Pond 152; and
  - Pond 117.
- 19. These are shown on *Figure 22.4.2a 22.4.2f*. The remaining 18 ponds that were surveyed in 2018 returned a negative result for great crested newt eDNA, so there is no reasonable likelihood of this species being present in association with these ponds (*Figure 22.4.2a 22.4.2f*).
- 20. Great crested newts are known to exist as meta-populations within small aggregations or clusters of ponds, i.e. individual great crested newts may travel between several ponds that are within proximity to one another (English Nature 2001). This allows genetic diversity within the breeding population and allows the population to move freely, depending on changing conditions. Based on this





- information, clusters of ponds within distinct areas can be classified as potentially supporting distinct meta-populations of great crested newts.
- 21. Further surveys for population class assessments will be undertaken in the appropriate survey window prior to the commencement of construction. The findings of which will inform and develop the EPSML and mitigation measures that will be required to ensure compliance with the legislation afforded to great crested newts. Furthermore, a Rapid Risk Assessment has been undertaken which concluded that a European Protected Species (EPS) licence is likely to be required.
- 22. Results of these great crested newt survey relevant to the onshore development area are carried through into the EcIA presented in *Chapter 22 Onshore Ecology*.

**Environmental Statement** 



#### 22.7 References

Briggs, J., Ewald, N., Valentini, A., Gaboriaund, C., Griffiths, R.A., Foster, J., Wilkinson, J., Arnett, A., Williams, P. & Dunn, F. (2014) Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt.

Appendix 5: Technical advice note for field and laboratory sampling of great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) Environmental DNA, Freshwater Habitats Trust, Oxford.

English Nature, (2001) *Great Crested Newt Mitigation Guidelines*. English Nature, Peterborough.

Natural England, (2016) Great Crested Newt Method Statement for EPS Licence Application, [Online], Available: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/great-crested-newts-apply-for-a-mitigation-licence">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/great-crested-newts-apply-for-a-mitigation-licence</a> Accessed [July 31 2018].

Oldham, R.S., Keeble, J., Swan, M.J.S. & Jeffcote, M. (2000) Evaluating the suitability of habitat for the Great Crested Newt (*Triturus cristatus*). *Herpetological Journal* **10** (4): 143 – 155.



# **Annex 1: eDNA Result Report**



**Customer:** Royal Haskoning DHV

Address: Rightwell House

**Bretton** 

Peterborough

PE3 8DW

Contact:

Email: -

Tel:

Report date: 12-Jul-2018

Order Number: GCN18-0836

Samples: Pond Water

**Analysis requested:** Detection of Great Crested Newt eDNA from pond water.

Thank you for submitting your samples for analysis with the Fera eDNA testing service. The details of the analysis are as follows:

#### Method:

The method detects pond occupancy from great crested newts (GCN) using traces of DNA shed into the pond environment (eDNA). The detection of GCN eDNA is carried out using real time PCR to amplify part of the cytochrome 1 gene found in mitochondrial DNA. The method followed is detailed in Biggs J., et al, (2014). Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt. Appendix 5. Technical advice note for field and laboratory sampling of great crested newt (Triturus cristatus) environmental DNA. Freshwater Habitats Trust, Oxford.

The limits of this method are as follows: 1) the results are based on analyses of the samples supplied by the client and as received by the laboratory, 2) any variation between the characteristics of this sample and a batch will depend on the sampling procedure used. 3) the method is qualitative and therefore the levels given in the score are for information only, they do not constitute the quantification of GCN DNA against a calibration curve, 4) a 'not detected' result does not exclude presence at levels below the limit of detection.

The results are defined as follows:

**Positive:** DNA from the species was detected.

**eDNA Score:** Number of positive replicates from a series of twelve.

**Negative:** DNA from the species was not detected; in the case of negative samples the DNA extract is further

tested for PCR inhibitors and degradation of the sample.

Inconclusive: Controls indicate degradation or inhibition of the sample, therefore the lack of detection of GCN

DNA is not conclusive evidence for determining the absence of the species in the sample provided.



| CustomerReference | Fera Reference | GCN Detection | eDNA Score | Inhibition | Degradation |
|-------------------|----------------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Pond 19           | S18-004076     | Negative      | 0          | No         | No          |
| Pond 18           | S18-004073     | Negative      | 0          | No         | No          |
| Pond 135          | S18-004091     | Positive      | 12         | n/a        | n/a         |

The results indicate that eDNA for great crested newts was detected in one of the samples and in the remaining samples eDNA was not detected (as detailed in the table above). Analysis was conducted in the presence of the following controls: 1) extraction blank, 2) appropriate positive and negative PCR controls for each of the TaqMan assays (GCN, Inhibition, and Degradation). All controls performed as expected.

This test procedure was developed using research funded by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

**Issuing officer: Steven Bryce** 

Tel: -Email: -



**Customer:** Royal Haskoning DHV

Address: Rightwell House

**Bretton** 

Peterborough

PE3 8DW

Contact:

Email:

Tel: -

Report date: 14-Jun-2018

Order Number: GCN18-0836

Samples: Pond Water

**Analysis requested:** Detection of Great Crested Newt eDNA from pond water.

Thank you for submitting your samples for analysis with the Fera eDNA testing service. The details of the analysis are as follows:

#### Method:

The method detects pond occupancy from great crested newts (GCN) using traces of DNA shed into the pond environment (eDNA). The detection of GCN eDNA is carried out using real time PCR to amplify part of the cytochrome 1 gene found in mitochondrial DNA. The method followed is detailed in Biggs J., et al, (2014). Analytical and methodological development for improved surveillance of the Great Crested Newt. Appendix 5. Technical advice note for field and laboratory sampling of great crested newt (Triturus cristatus) environmental DNA. Freshwater Habitats Trust, Oxford.

The limits of this method are as follows: 1) the results are based on analyses of the samples supplied by the client and as received by the laboratory, 2) any variation between the characteristics of this sample and a batch will depend on the sampling procedure used. 3) the method is qualitative and therefore the levels given in the score are for information only, they do not constitute the quantification of GCN DNA against a calibration curve, 4) a 'not detected' result does not exclude presence at levels below the limit of detection.

The results are defined as follows:

**Positive:** DNA from the species was detected.

**eDNA Score:** Number of positive replicates from a series of twelve.

**Negative:** DNA from the species was not detected; in the case of negative samples the DNA extract is further

tested for PCR inhibitors and degradation of the sample.

Inconclusive: Controls indicate degradation or inhibition of the sample, therefore the lack of detection of GCN

DNA is not conclusive evidence for determining the absence of the species in the sample provided.



| CustomerReference | Fera Reference | <b>GCN</b> Detection | eDNA Score | Inhibition | Degradation |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| P112              | S18-004114     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P140              | S18-004115     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P120              | S18-004116     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P125              | S18-004117     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P137              | S18-004119     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P114              | S18-004118     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P139              | S18-004120     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P113              | S18-004121     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P152              | S18-004122     | Positive             | 3          | n/a        | n/a         |
| P115              | S18-004123     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P117              | S18-004124     | Positive             | 4          | n/a        | n/a         |
| NP1               | S18-004125     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| Р9                | S18-004126     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P118              | S18-004127     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P3                | S18-004128     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P73               | S18-004129     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P6                | S18-004131     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |
| P158              | S18-004132     | Negative             | 0          | No         | No          |

The results indicate that eDNA for great crested newts was detected in two of the samples and in the remaining samples eDNA was not detected (as detailed in the table above).

Analysis was conducted in the presence of the following controls: 1) extraction blank, 2) appropriate positive and negative PCR controls for each of the TaqMan assays (GCN, Inhibition, and Degradation). All controls performed as expected.

This test procedure was developed using research funded by the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.

**Issuing officer: Steven Bryce** 

Tel: -Email: -



# **Annex 2: Supporting Figures**

**Environmental Statement** 



| This page | is | intentiona | lly | blank. |
|-----------|----|------------|-----|--------|
|-----------|----|------------|-----|--------|























