

# Annual Environmental Report

2023



Summerhill

D0259-01

## **CONTENTS**

### **1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION TO THE 2023 AER**

- 1.1 ANNUAL STATEMENT OF MEASURES
- 1.2 TREATMENT SUMMARY
- 1.3 ELV OVERVIEW
- 1.4 LICENSE SPECIFIC REPORT INCLUDED IN AER

### **2 TREATMENT PLANT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT SUMMARY**

- 2.1 SUMMERHILL WWTP - TREATED DISCHARGE
  - 2.1.1 INFLUENT SUMMARY - SUMMERHILL WWTP
  - 2.1.2 EFFLUENT MONITORING SUMMARY - SUMMERHILL WWTP
  - 2.1.3 AMBIENT MONITORING SUMMARY FOR THE TREATMENT PLANT DISCHARGE
  - 2.1.4 OPERATIONAL REPORTS SUMMARY FOR SUMMERHILL WWTP
  - 2.1.5 SLUDGE/OTHER INPUTS TO SUMMERHILL WWTP

### **3 COMPLAINTS AND INCIDENTS**

- 3.1 COMPLAINTS SUMMARY
- 3.2 REPORTED INCIDENTS SUMMARY
  - 3.2.1 SUMMARY OF INCIDENTS
  - 3.2.2 SUMMARY OF OVERALL INCIDENTS

### **4 INFRASTRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAMME OF IMPROVEMENTS**

- 4.1 STORM WATER OVERFLOW IDENTIFICATION AND INSPECTION REPORT
  - 4.1.1 SWO IDENTIFICATION AND INSPECTION SUMMARY REPORT
- 4.2 REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE AND PROPOSALS BEING DEVELOPED TO MEET THE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME REQUIREMENTS
  - 4.2.1 SPECIFIED IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME SUMMARY
  - 4.2.2 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME SUMMARY
  - 4.2.3 SEWER INTEGRITY RISK ASSESSMENT

### **5 LICENCE SPECIFIC REPORTS**

- 5.1 PRIORITY SUBSTANCES ASSESSMENT
- 5.2 SMALL STREAM RISK SCORE ASSESSMENT

### **6 CERTIFICATION AND SIGN OFF**

- 6.1 SUMMARY OF AER CONTENTS

### **7 APPENDIX**

- 7.1 SMALL STREAM RISK SCORE ASSESSMENT

# 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND INTRODUCTION TO THE 2023 AER

This Annual Environmental Report has been prepared for D0259-01, Summerhill, in Meath in accordance with the requirements of the wastewater discharge licence for the agglomeration. Specified reports where relevant are included as an appendix to the AER.

## 1.1 ANNUAL STATEMENT OF MEASURES

A summary of any improvements undertaken is provided where applicable.

There were no capital works, significant changes or operational changes undertaken in 2023.

## 1.2 TREATMENT SUMMARY

The agglomeration is served by a wastewater treatment plant(s)

- Summerhill WWTP with a Plant Capacity PE of 3000, the treatment type is 3P - Tertiary P removal .

## 1.3 ELV OVERVIEW

The overall compliance of the final effluent with the Emission Limit Values (ELVs) is shown below. More detailed information on the below ELV's can be found in Section 2.

Discharge Point Reference	Treatment Plant	Discharge Type	Compliance Status	Parameters failing if relevant
TPEFF2300D0259SW001	Summerhill WWTP	Treated	Non-Compliant	ortho-Phosphate (as P) - unspecified mg/l

## 1.4 LICENCE SPECIFIC REPORTING

Assessment / Report

**Small Stream Risk Score Assessment**

## 2 TREATMENT PLANT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT SUMMARY

### 2.1 SUMMERHILL WWTP - TREATED DISCHARGE

#### 2.1.1 INFLUENT MONITORING SUMMARY - SUMMERHILL WWTP

A summary of influent monitoring for the treatment plant is presented below. This monitoring is primarily undertaken in order to determine the overall efficiency of the plant in removing pollutants from the raw wastewater.

Parameters	Number of Samples	Annual Max	Annual Mean
Total Phosphorus (as P) mg/l	12	5.79	4.13
COD-Cr mg/l	12	412	274
BOD, 5 days with Inhibition (Carbonaceous BOD) mg/l	12	206	115
Suspended Solids mg/l	12	186	89
Total Nitrogen mg/l	12	47	34
Hydraulic Capacity	N/A	2353	537

If other inputs in the form of sludge / leachate are added to the WWTP then these are included in Section 2.1.5 if applicable.

#### Significance of Results:

The annual mean hydraulic loading is less than the peak Treatment Plant Capacity. The annual maximum hydraulic loading is greater than the peak Treatment Plant Capacity. Further details on the plant capacity and efficiency can be found under the sectional 'Operational Performance Summary'.

## 2.1.2 EFFLUENT MONITORING SUMMARY - TPEFF2300D0259SW001

Parameter	WWDL ELV (Schedule A)	ELV with Condition 2 Interpretation included Note 1	Interim % reduction from influent concentration	Number of sample results	Number of exceedances	Number of exceedances with Condition 2 Interpretation included	Annual Mean	Overall Compliance (Pass/Fail)
<b>COD-Cr mg/l</b>	125	250	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	14	Pass
<b>Suspended Solids mg/l</b>	35	87.5	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	4.25	Pass
<b>pH pH units</b>	6	9	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	7.63	Pass
<b>BOD, 5 days with Inhibition (Carbonaceous BOD) mg/l</b>	5	10	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	1.37	Pass
<b>Ammonia-Total (as N) mg/l</b>	1	2	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	0.019	Pass
<b>ortho-Phosphate (as P) - unspecified mg/l</b>	0.5	0.6	N/A	12	1	1	0.160	Fail
<b>Total Phosphorus (as P) mg/l</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	0.187	

Notes:

1 – This represents the Emission Limit Values after the Interpretation provided for under Condition 2 of the licence is applied

2 – For pH the WWDA specifies a range of pH 6 - 9

## Cause of Exceedance(s):

Dosing pump failure or maintenance at WWTP

## Significance of Results:

The WWTP is non compliant with the ELV's set in the Wastewater Discharge Licence. The impact on receiving waters is assessed further in Section 2.

### 2.1.3 AMBIENT MONITORING SUMMARY FOR THE TREATMENT PLANT DISCHARGE TPEFF2300D0259SW001

A summary of monitoring from ambient monitoring points associated with the wastewater discharge is provided in the sections below. For discharges to rivers upstream (U/S) and downstream (D/S) location data is provided. For other ambient points in lakes, coastal or transitional waters, monitoring data from the most appropriate monitoring station is selected.

The table below provides details of ambient monitoring locations and details of any designations as sensitive areas.

Ambient Monitoring Point from WWDL (or as agreed with EPA)	Irish Grid Reference	River Station Code	Bathing Water	Drinking Water	FWPM	Shellfish	WFD Ecological Status
Upstream	285788, 248965	RS07K020200	No	No	No	No	Poor
Downstream	283268, 250875	RS07K020300	No	No	No	No	Poor

The table below provides a summary of monitoring results for designated ambient monitoring points. The upstream and downstream annual mean values are shown (mg/l), and the difference between both monitoring stations is given as a percentage of the Environmental Quality Standard (EQS) where relevant.

Parameter Name	Upstream Monitoring Point Location	Upstream Monitoring Point Annual Mean	Downstream Monitoring Point Location	Downstream Monitoring Point Annual Mean	EQS	% of EQS
BOD - 5 days (Total) mg/l	RS07K020200	1.67	RS07K020300	1.14	1.50	-35.3

Parameter Name	Upstream Monitoring Point Location	Upstream Monitoring Point Annual Mean	Downstream Monitoring Point Location	Downstream Monitoring Point Annual Mean	EQS	% of EQS
<b>Ammonia-Total (as N) mg/l</b>	RS07K020200	0.045	RS07K020300	0.051	0.065	9
<b>ortho-Phosphate (as P) - unspecified mg/l</b>	RS07K020200	0.100	RS07K020300	0.075	0.035	-69.7
<b>Total Nitrogen mg/l</b>	RS07K020200	1.69	RS07K020300	2.13	N/A	
<b>Dissolved Oxygen % Saturation</b>	RS07K020200	97	RS07K020300	92	N/A	
<b>Dissolved Oxygen mg/l</b>	RS07K020200	9.68	RS07K020300	10	N/A	
<b>pH pH units</b>	RS07K020200	8.17	RS07K020300	8.05	N/A	

### Significance of Results:

The WWTP discharge was not compliant with the ELV's set in the wastewater discharge licence for the following: ortho-Phosphate (as P) - unspecified mg/l.

The ambient monitoring results do not meet the required EQS at the upstream and the downstream monitoring locations. The EQS relates to the Oxygenation and Nutrient Conditions set out in the Surface Water Regulations 2009.

Based on ambient monitoring results a deterioration in Ammonia concentration downstream of the effluent discharge is noted.

A deterioration in water quality has been identified, however it is not known if it or is not caused by the WWTP.

As per the 3rd Cycle Draft Boyne Catchment Report (HA 07), the significant pressure on the Knightbrook\_020 waterbody is Agriculture.

The discharge from the wastewater treatment plant does not have an observable negative impact on the Water Framework Directive status.



## 2.1.4 OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY - SUMMERHILL WWTP

### 2.1.4.1 Treatment Efficiency Report - Summerhill WWTP

Treatment efficiency is based on the removal of key pollutants from the influent wastewater by the treatment plant. In essence the calculation is based on the balance of load coming into the plant versus the load leaving the plant. The efficiency is presented as a percentage removal rate.

A summary presentation of the efficiency of the treatment process including information for all the parameters specified in the licence is included below:

Parameter	Influent mass loading (kg/year)	Effluent mass emission (kg/year)	Efficiency (% reduction of influent load)
SS	20266	753	96
COD	62178	2526	96
cBOD	26066	242	99
TP	935	33	96

Note: The above data is based on sample results for the number of dates reported

### 2.1.4.2 Treatment Capacity Report Summary - Summerhill WWTP

Treatment capacity is an assessment of the hydraulic (flow) and organic (the amount of pollutants) load a treatment plant is designed to treat versus the current loading of that plant.

Summerhill WWTP	
Peak Hydraulic Capacity (m <sup>3</sup> /day) - As Constructed	2025
DWF to the Treatment Plant (m <sup>3</sup> /day)	675
Current Hydraulic Loading - annual max (m <sup>3</sup> /day)	2353
Average Hydraulic loading to the Treatment Plant (m <sup>3</sup> /day)	537

Summerhill WWTP	
Organic Capacity (PE) - As Constructed	3000
Organic Capacity (PE) - Collected Load (peak week) <sup>Note1</sup>	1102
Organic Capacity (PE) - Remaining	1898
Will the capacity be exceeded in the next three years? (Yes/No)	No

Nominal design capacities can be based on conservative design principles. In some cases assessment of existing plants has shown organic capacities significantly higher than the nominal design capacity. Accordingly plants that appear to be overloaded when comparing a collected peak load with the nominal design capacity can be fully compliant due to the safety factors in the original design.

## 2.1.5 SLUDGE / OTHER INPUTS - SUMMERHILL WWTP

'Other inputs' to the waste water treatment plant are summarised in the table below.

Input type	Quantity	Unit	P.E.	% of load to WWTP	Included in Influent Monitoring (Y/N)?	Is there a leachate/sludge acceptance procedure for the WWTP?	Is there a dedicated leachate/sludge acceptance facility for the WWTP? (Y/N)
<b>There is no Sludge and Other Input data for the Treatment Plant included in the AER.</b>							

## 3 COMPLAINTS AND INCIDENTS

### 3.1 COMPLAINTS SUMMARY

A summary of complaints of an environmental nature related to the discharge(s) to water from the WWTP and network is included below.

Number of Complaints	Nature of Complaint	Number Open Complaints	Number Closed Complaints
<b>There were no relevant environmental complaints in 2023.</b>			

### 3.2 REPORTED INCIDENTS SUMMARY

Environmental incidents that arise in an agglomeration are reported on an on-going basis in accordance with our waste water discharge licences. Where an incident occurs and it is reportable under the licence, it is reported to the Environmental Protection Agency through their Environmental Data Exchange Network, or in some instances by telephone. Some incidents which arise in the agglomeration are recorded by Uisce Éireann but may not be reportable under our licence for example where the incident does not have an impact on environmental performance.

A summary of reported incidents is included below.

#### 3.2.1 SUMMARY OF INCIDENTS

Incident Type	Cause	Recurring (Y/N)	Closed (Y/N)
<b>Breach of ELV</b>	Dosing pump failure or maintenance at WWTP	No	Yes

### 3.2.2 SUMMARY OF OVERALL INCIDENTS

Question	Answer
Number of Incidents in 2023	1
Number of Incidents reported to the EPA via EDEN in 2023	1
Explanation of any discrepancies between the two numbers above	N/A

## 4 INFRASTRUCTURAL ASSESSMENTS AND PROGRAMME OF IMPROVEMENTS

### 4.1 STORM WATER OVERFLOW IDENTIFICATION AND INSPECTION REPORT

A summary of the operation of the storm water overflows and their significance where known is included below:

#### 4.1.1 SWO IDENTIFICATION

WWDL Name / Code for Storm Water Overflow (chamber) where applicable	Irish Grid Ref. (outfall)	Included in Schedule of the WWDL	Significance of the overflow(High / Medium / Low)	Assessed against DoEHLG Criteria	No. of times activated in 2023 (No. of events)	Total volume discharged in 2023 (m <sup>3</sup> )	Monitoring Status
<b>SW2</b>	284910 249401	Yes	Low Significance	Meeting Criteria	0	0	Monitored

Any TBC SWO(s) were identified as part of the on-going National SWO programme and will be updated in subsequent AER(s) once the information is confirmed.

SWO Summary	
How much wastewater discharge by metered SWOs during the year (m <sup>3</sup> )?	0
Is each SWO identified as not meeting DoEHLG Guidance included in the Programme of Improvements?	N/A
The SWO Assessment included the requirements of relevant of WWDL schedules?	Yes
Have the EPA been advised of any additional SWOs / changes to Schedule C3 and A4 under Condition 1.7?	N/A

## 4.2 REPORT ON PROGRESS MADE AND PROPOSALS BEING DEVELOPED TO MEET THE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME REQUIREMENTS

### 4.2.1 SPECIFIED IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME SUMMARY

A wastewater discharge licence may require a number of reports on specific subject areas to be prepared for the agglomeration in question. These reports are submitted to the EPA as part of the Annual Environmental Report. This section provides a list of the various reports required for this agglomeration and a brief summary of their recommendations.

Specified Improvement Programmes (under Schedule A and C of WWDL)	Description	Licence Schedule	Licence Completion Date	Date Expired? (N/N/A/Y)	Status of Works	Timeframe for Completing the Work	Comments
<b>D0259-SIP:01</b>	Assessment of the options to reduce the impact of the primary discharge on the Cloneymeath River in accordance with Condition 5.2(d)	C	28/02/2013	Yes	Not Started		

A summary of the status of any other improvements identified by under Condition 5 assessments- is included below.

### 4.2.2 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME SUMMARY

Improvement Identifier	Improvement Description / or any Operational Improvements	Improvement Source	Expected Completion Date	Comments
<b>No additional improvements planned at this time.</b>				

**4.2.3 SEWER INTEGRITY RISK ASSESSMENT**

N/A

## 5 LICENCE SPECIFIC REPORTS

A wastewater discharge licence may require a number of reports on specific subject areas to be prepared for the agglomeration in question. These reports are submitted to the EPA as part of the Annual Environmental Report. This section provides a list of the various reports required for this agglomeration and a brief summary of their recommendations.

Licence Specific Report	Required by licence	Included in this AER
Priority Substances Assessment	Yes	No
Small Stream Risk Score Assessment	Yes	Yes



## 6 CERTIFICATION AND SIGN OFF

### 6.1 SUMMARY OF AER CONTENTS

Parameter	Answer
Does the AER include an Executive Summary?	Yes
Does the AER include an assessment of the performance of the Waste Water Works (i.e. have the results of assessments been interpreted against WWDL requirements and or Environmental Quality Standards)?	Yes
Is there a need to advise the EPA for Consideration of a Technical Amendment/Review of the Licence?	No
List reason e.g. additional SWO identified	N/A
Is there a need to request/advise the EPA of any modification to the existing WWDL with respect to condition 4 changes to monitoring location, frequency etc	Yes
List reason e.g. changes to monitoring requirements	Ambient Monitoring Location Changes
Have these processes commenced?	No
Are all outstanding reports and assessments from previous AERs included as an appendix to this AER	N/A

I certify that the information given in this Annual Environmental Report is truthful, accurate and complete:

Date: 28/02/2024

This AER has been produced by Uisce Éireann's Environmental Information System (EIMS) and has been electronically signed off in that system for and on behalf of,

Eleanor Roche

Head of Environmental Regulation.

## 7 APPENDIX

Appendix

**Appendix 7.1 - Small Stream Risk Score Assessment**



# Summerhill, Co. Meath: Small-Streams Risk Score (SSRS)

Report for  
Meath County Council

October 2023



# Summerhill, Co. Meath: Small-Streams Risk Score (SSRS)

*Report prepared for:*

Meath County Council,  
Buvinda House, Dublin Road  
Navan,  
Co. Meath.

October 2023



**Botanical, Environmental & Conservation Consultants Ltd.**

65 Holywell, Dundrum, Dublin 14

Website: [www.botanicalenvironmental.com](http://www.botanicalenvironmental.com)

Email: [info@botanicalenvironmental.com](mailto:info@botanicalenvironmental.com)





## DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

<b>Client</b>	Meath County Council
<b>Project title</b>	Summerhill SSRS
<b>Project number</b>	PRJ349
<b>Document title</b>	Summerhill Small-Streams Risk Score (SSRS)
<b>Citation</b>	Brophy, J.T. (2023) Summerhill Small-Streams Risk Score (SSRS). Unpublished Report by BEC Consultants Ltd.

<b>Author(s)</b>	<b>Reviewed by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Version</b>	<b>Issue date</b>
John T. Brophy B.A., M.Sc., MCIEEM, CEcol.	Jim Martin, Ph.D., MCIEEM	Jim Martin, Ph.D., MCIEEM	V1.0	04/10/2023

## Table of Contents

1	Background.....	1
2	Methods .....	1
3	Results .....	1
4	Conclusion .....	2
5	References.....	2
	Appendix I – Score sheets .....	3



## 1 Background

BEC Consultants Ltd was contracted to carry out macroinvertebrate sampling on the Cloneymeath River and calculate a Small-Streams Risk Score (SSRS) for two samples taken upstream and downstream of Summerhill Waste Water Works, Summerhill, Co. Meath.

## 2 Methods

Two samples were taken on the Cloneymeath River, one upstream (u/s) and one downstream (d/s) of the Summerhill Waste Water Works discharge location by John Brophy of BEC Consultants, who is an EPA-registered SSRS assessor, on 2 October 2023 following the SSRS field methodology (Anon. 2009). The samples were taken using a standard hand-net and the SSRS calculated following the methods set out in the 'Small Streams Risk Score (SSRS) Training Manual' (Anon., 2009).

## 3 Results

The SSRS groups and taxa recorded from the upstream (u/s) and downstream (d/s) sample stations, with their relative abundances, are presented in Table 1 and Table 2, respectively. No Group 1 or Group 2 taxa were recorded at either sample station.

**Table 1.** SSRS groups and taxa from the upstream (u/s) sample station on the Cloneymeath River, Summerhill, Co. Meath taken on 2 October 2023.

Group	Taxon	Relative abundance (1-5)
<b>Group 1 Ephemeroptera</b>	-	-
<b>Group 2 Plecoptera</b>	-	-
<b>Group 3 Trichoptera</b>	Limnephilidae	1
	Sericostomatidae	1
<b>Group 4 G.O.L.D.</b>	Tubificidae	1
	Chironomus	1
	Simuliidae	2
	Tipulidae	1
	Ceratopogonidae	1
<b>Group 5 Asellus</b>	<i>Asellus</i>	Common/Numerous

**Table 2.** SSRS groups and taxa from the downstream (d/s) sample station on the Cloneymeath River, Summerhill, Co. Meath on 2 October 2023.

Group	Taxon	Relative abundance (1-5)
<b>Group 1 Ephemeroptera</b>	-	-
<b>Group 2 Plecoptera</b>	-	-
<b>Group 3 Trichoptera</b>	Hydropsychidae	2
	Polycentropodidae	1
	<i>Rhyacophila</i>	1
	Sericostomatidae	1
<b>Group 4 G.O.L.D.</b>	Tubificidae	1
	Chironomidae	1

	Simuliidae	2
	Tipulidae	1
	Ceratopogonidae	1
<b>Group 5 Asellus</b>	<i>Asellus</i>	Few/Low

---

The SSRS for each sample station was calculated following the methods of Anon. (2009) and the results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** The Small-Streams Risk Score for two sample stations on the Cloneymeath River, Summerhill, Co. Meath on 2 October 2023.

Sample station	SSRS	Category
Upstream (u/s)	2.4	At risk
Downstream (d/s)	4	At risk

The SSRS scoresheets for sites u/s and d/s are presented in Appendix I, with photographs presented in Appendix II.

## 4 Conclusion

The SSRS for the upstream station (U/S) was 2.4, while that for the downstream station (D/S) was 4. Therefore, despite the difference in the scores, the Cloneymeath River, at both upstream and downstream locations, is 'At risk' of not meeting 'Good' status under the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC).

## 5 References

Anonymous (2009). Small Streams Risk Score (SSRS) Training Manual: A Pollution Investigation Tool for Use in the Field. Prepared on behalf of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Environmental Protection Agency and Water Services National Training Group (wsntg). (February 2020).

## Appendix I – Score sheets

<b>River:</b> CLONEYMEATH	<b>Code:</b> 07K02	<b>Date:</b> 2/10/2023	<b>Time:</b> 09:50
<b>Station no.:</b> u/s	<b>Location:</b> SUMMERHILL	<b>Grid (6 figure):</b> N857489	
<b>Field Chemistry</b>		<b>Stream Order:</b> 2	<b>Stream flow:</b> Riffle Riffle/Glide Slow flow
DO%	97	<b>Modifications:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N Canalised-widened-bank erosion-arterial drainage	
DO mg/l	9.4	<b>Dominant Types:</b>	
Temp (°C)	12.3	Bedrock	
Conductivity	545 µS	Boulder (>128mm)	
pH	7.94	Cobble (32-128mm)	
Bank width (cm)	470	Gravel (8-32mm)	
Wet width (cm)	320	Fine Gravel (2-8mm)	
Avg Depth (cm)	30	Sand (0.25-2mm)	
Staff gauge		Silt (<0.25mm)	
<b>Velocity</b>	<b>Colour</b>	<b>Slope:</b> Low - Medium - High - Very High	<b>Shading:</b> High - Moderate - Low - None
Torrential	None	<b>Geology:</b> Calcareous-Siliceous-Mixed	<b>Cattle access</b> Y: upstream - downstream of <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N
Fast	Slight	<b>Substratum Condition:</b> Calcareous-Compacted-Loose - Normal	
Moderate	Moderate	<b>Substratum:</b>	<b>Photo:</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N
Slow	High	Stoney bottom-Muddy bottom-Mud over stones	u/s + DS
Very slow		<b>Degree of siltation:</b> Clean Slight-Moderate-Heavy	
<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Discharge</b>	<b>Depth of mud:</b> None: <1cm, 1-5cm: 5-10cm: >10cm	
Very clear	Flood	<b>Litter:</b> None - Present - Moderate - Abundant	
Clear	Normal	<b>Filamentous Algae:</b>	<b>Sewage Fungus:</b>
Slightly turbid	Low	None - Present - Moderate - Abundant	None - Present - Moderate - Abundant
Highly turbid	Very Low	<b>Main land use u/s:</b>	<b>Sample retained:</b>
	Dry	Pasture Urban	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N
	Recent Flood	Bog Tillage	
		Forestry Other	
			<b>Sampled in Minutes:</b>
			Pond net x 2
			Stone wash x 1
			Weed sweep x 0

**General Comments:**  
WATER COLOUR/TURBIDITY INCREASED DRAMATICALLY BETWEEN START AND END OF SURVEY.

Macroinvertebrate Composition				Relative Abundance	
The macroinvertebrates are divided into the following 5 specific groups:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Group 1 = Ephemeroptera (3-tails) - note that tails may be damaged during sampling</li> <li>Group 2 = Plecoptera (2-tails) - note that tails may be damaged during sampling</li> <li>Group 3 = Trichoptera</li> <li>Group 4 = G.O.L.D (Gastropoda, Oligochaeta and Diptera)</li> <li>Group 5 = Asellus</li> </ul>					
Calculate the total number of taxa and relative abundance of each macroinvertebrate group below: (Abundance - Ab)					
<b>Ephemeroptera:</b>	<i>Ecdyonurus</i> Ab	<b>Plecoptera:</b>	<i>Leuctra</i> Ab		
	<i>Rhythrogena</i> Ab		<i>Isoperla</i> Ab		
	<i>Heptagenia</i> Ab		<i>Protonemura</i> Ab		
	<i>Ephemerella</i> Ab		<i>Amphinemura</i> Ab		
	<i>Caenis</i> Ab		<i>Perla</i> Ab		
	<i>Paraleptophlebia</i> Ab		<i>Dinocras</i> Ab		
	<i>Ephemerella danica</i> Ab		Other Plecop Ab		
	Other Ephem Ab		Other Plecop Ab		
<b>Total no. of taxa</b>	0	<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	0	<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	0
<b>Trichoptera:</b>	Hydropsychidae Ab	<b>G.O.L.D:</b>	<i>Lymnaea</i> (G) Ab	<b>Chironomidae (D) Ab</b>	<b>Asellus:</b>
	Polycentropodidae Ab		<i>Potamopyrgus</i> (G) Ab	<i>Chironomus</i> (D) Ab	1 Absent
	<i>Rhyacophila</i> Ab		<i>Planorbis</i> (G) Ab	<i>Simuliidae</i> (D) Ab	2 Few/Low
	Philopotamidae Ab		<i>Ancylus</i> (G) Ab	<i>Dicranota</i> (D) Ab	Common/Numerous ✓
	Limnephilidae Ab		<i>Physa</i> (G) Ab	<i>Tipulidae</i> (D) Ab	1
	Sericostomatidae Ab		<i>Lumbriculus</i> (OI) Ab	<i>Ceratopogonidae</i> (D) Ab	1
	Glossosomatidae Ab		<i>Eiseniella</i> (OI) Ab	Other GOLD Ab	
	Lepidostomatidae Ab		<i>Tubificidae</i> (OI) Ab		
	Other Trichoptera Ab				
<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	2	<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	5	<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	6

**NOTE** *Baetis* is an Ephemeropteran and is the most commonly occurring invertebrate genus in streams in Ireland. It is vital that *Baetis* is not counted in SSRS. See Appendix B for more details on how to identify *Baetis*.

Figure A1: SSRS score sheet page 1 at upstream (u/s) site on the Cloneymeath River, Summerhill, Co. Meath.

**Step 1.** Calculate the Index Score by circling the appropriate box representing the total number of taxa and the total abundance calculated from *each macroinvertebrate group* calculated from page 1 of the recording sheet and enter in to the boxes in Step 2.

**Group 1 - 3 Tails Ephemeroptera**

No. of taxa: 0 (circled), 1, 2+

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3+

Score: 0 (circled), 4, 6, 4, 8

**Group 2 - 2 Tails Plecoptera**

No. of taxa: 0 (circled), 1, 2+

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3+, 2, 3+

Score: 0 (circled), 4, 6, 6, 8

**Group 3 Trichoptera**

No. of taxa: 0, 1-2 (circled), 3+

Relative Abundance: 1-2 (circled), 3+

Score: 0, 2 (circled), 4, 4

**Group 4 G.O.L.D**

No. of taxa: 0, 1-2, 3+ (circled)

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3-6, 7+, 3-6 (circled), 7+

Score: 0, 4, 2, 0, 4 (circled), 0

**Group 5 Aseflus**

No. of taxa: Absent, Few (1-20), Common (>20)

Score: 4, 2, 0 (circled)

**Step 2**

a) Index Score Group 1	0
b) Index Score Group 2	0
c) Index Score Group 3	2
d) Index Score Group 4	4
e) Index Score Group 5	0

**Step 3.** Calculate the Total Index Score, the Average Index Score and the SSR Score using the boxes below

Total Index Score (TIS) sum (a+b+c+d+e) 6      Average Index Score (AIS) TIS/5 (5 for 5 groups) 1.2      SSR Score (AIS x 2) 2.4

**Step 4.** Assess the stream by comparing the final SSR score with the categories below and tick the appropriate box

> 7.25  Probably not at risk      > 6.5 – 7.25  Indeterminate Stream may be at risk      < 6.5  Stream at risk

Surveyor (signed): *[Signature]*      Name (print): JOHN BROPHY      Date: 2 / 10 / 2023

Figure A2: SSRS score sheet page 2 at upstream (u/s) site on the Cloneymeth River, Summerhill, Co. Meath.

<b>River:</b> CLONEYMEATH	<b>Code:</b> 07K02	<b>Date:</b> 2/10/2023	<b>Time:</b> 11:00
<b>Station no.:</b> D/S	<b>Location:</b> SUMMERHILL	<b>Grid (6 figure):</b> N832508	
<b>Field Chemistry</b>		<b>Stream Order:</b> 3	<b>Stream flow:</b> Riffle Riffle/Glide Slow flow
DO%	9.4	<b>Modifications:</b> Y/N Canalised-widened (bank erosion) arterial drainage <b>Dominant Types:</b> Bedrock Boulder (>128mm) Cobble (32-128mm) Gravel (8-32mm) Fine Gravel (2-8mm) Sand (0.25-2mm) Silt (<0.25mm) <b>Slope:</b> Low - Medium - High - Very High <b>Geology:</b> Calcareous Siliceous-Mixed <b>Substratum Condition:</b> Calcareous-Compacted-Loose (Normal) <b>Substratum:</b> Stony bottom-Muddy bottom (Mud over stones) <b>Degree of siltation:</b> Clean-Slight-Moderate-Heavy <b>Depth of mud:</b> None <1cm: 1-5cm: 5-10cm: >10cm <b>Litter:</b> (None) Present - Moderate - Abundant <b>Filamentous Algae:</b> None - Present - Moderate - Abundant <b>Main land use u/s:</b> Pastures Urban Tillage Bog Forestry <b>Sample retained:</b> Y (N)	<b>Shading:</b> High - Moderate - Low - None <b>Cattle access:</b> (Y) upstream - downstream or N ADJACENT <b>Photo:</b> (Y) / N U/S + D/S <b>Sewage Fungus:</b> (None) Present - Moderate - Abundant <b>Sampled in Minutes:</b> Pond net x 2 Stone wash x 1 Weed sweep x 0
DO mg/l	9.1		
Temp (°C)	12.4		
Conductivity	578 µS		
pH	7.86		
Bank width (cm)	600		
Wet width (cm)	310		
Avg Depth (cm)	60		
Staff gauge			
<b>Velocity</b>	<b>Colour</b>		
Torrential	None		
Fast	Slight		
(Moderate)	Moderate		
Slow	(High)		
Very slow			
<b>Clarity</b>	<b>Discharge</b>		
Very clear	(Flood)		
Clear	Normal		
Slightly turbid	Low		
(Highly turbid)	Very Low		
	Dry		
	Recent Flood		

**General Comments:**

WATER COLOUR/TURBIDITY HAD INCREASED DRAMATICALLY BY END OF U/S SAMPLING.

**Macroinvertebrate Composition**

The macroinvertebrates are divided into the following 5 specific groups:

- Group 1 = Ephemeroptera (3-tails) - note that tails may be damaged during sampling
- Group 2 = Plecoptera (2-tails) - note that tails may be damaged during sampling
- Group 3 = Trichoptera
- Group 4 = G.O.L.D (Gastropoda, Oligochaeta and Diptera)
- Group 5 = Asellus

Calculate the total number of taxa and relative abundance of each macroinvertebrate group below: (Abundance - Ab)

**Relative Abundance**

1-5	1
6-20	2
21-50	3
51-100	4
101+	5

<b>Ephemeroptera:</b>	<i>Ecdyonurus</i> Ab	<b>Plecoptera:</b>	<i>Leuctra</i> Ab
	<i>Rhithrogena</i> Ab		<i>Isoperla</i> Ab
	<i>Heptagenia</i> Ab		<i>Protonemura</i> Ab
	<i>Ephemerella</i> Ab		<i>Amphinemura</i> Ab
	<i>Caenis</i> Ab		<i>Perla</i> Ab
	<i>Paraleptophlebia</i> Ab		<i>Dinocras</i> Ab
	<i>Ephemera danica</i> Ab		Other Plecop Ab
	Other Ephem Ab		Other Plecop Ab
<b>Total no. of taxa</b>	0	<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	0
<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	0	<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	0
<b>Trichoptera:</b>	Hydropsychidae Ab 2	<b>G.O.L.D:</b>	<i>Lymnaea</i> (G) Ab
	Polycnetrotopodidae Ab 1		<i>Potamopyrgus</i> (G) Ab
	<i>Rhyacophila</i> Ab 1		<i>Planorbis</i> (G) Ab
	Philopotamidae Ab		<i>Ancylus</i> (G) Ab
	Limnephilidae Ab		<i>Physa</i> (G) Ab
	Sericostomatidae Ab 1		<i>Lumbriculus</i> (O) Ab
	Glossosomatidae Ab		<i>Eiseniella</i> (O) Ab
	Lepidostomatidae Ab		Tubificidae (O) Ab 1
	Other Trichoptera Ab		
<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	4	<b>Total no. of Taxa</b>	5
<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	5	<b>Total Relative Abundance</b>	6
			<b>Chironomidae</b> (D) Ab 1
			<i>Chironomus</i> (D) Ab
			Simuliidae (D) Ab 2
			<i>Dicranota</i> (D) Ab
			Tipulidae (D) Ab 1
			Ceratopogonidae (D) Ab
			Other GOLD Ab
			<b>Asellus:</b>
			Absent
			Few/Low
			Common/ Numerous

**NOTE:** *Baetis* is an Ephemeropteran and is the most commonly occurring invertebrate genus in streams in Ireland. It is vital that *Baetis* is not counted in SSRS. See Appendix B for more details on how to identify *Baetis*.

Figure A3: SSRS score sheet page 1 at downstream (d/s) site on the Clonemyeath River, Summerhill, Co. Meath.

**Step 1.** Calculate the Index Score by circling the appropriate box representing the total number of taxa and the total abundance calculated from *each macroinvertebrate group* calculated from page 1 of the recording sheet and enter in to the boxes in Step 2.

**Group 1 - 3 Tails Ephemeroptera**

No. of taxa: 0 (circled), 1, 2+

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3+

Score: 0 (circled), 4, 6, 4, 8

**Group 2 - 2 Tails Plecoptera**

No. of taxa: 0 (circled), 1, 2+

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3+, 2, 3+

Score: 0 (circled), 4, 6, 6, 8

**Group 3 Trichoptera**

No. of taxa: 0, 1-2, 3+ (circled)

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3+ (circled)

Score: 0, 2, 4, 4 (circled)

**Group 4 G.O.L.D**

No. of taxa: 0, 1-2, 3+ (circled)

Relative Abundance: 1-2, 3-6 (circled), 7+

Score: 0, 4, 2, 0, 4 (circled), 0

**Group 5 Asellus**

No. of taxa: Absent, Few (1-20) (circled), Common (>20)

Score: 4, 2 (circled), 0

**Step 2**

a) Index Score Group 1	0
b) Index Score Group 2	0
c) Index Score Group 3	4
d) Index Score Group 4	4
e) Index Score Group 5	2

**Step 3.** Calculate the Total Index Score, the Average Index Score and the SSR Score using the boxes below

Total Index Score (TIS)  
sum (a+b+c+d+e) 10

Average Index Score (AIS)  
TIS/5 (5 for 5 groups) 2

SSR Score  
(AIS x 2) 4

**Step 4.** Assess the stream by comparing the final SSR score with the categories below and tick the appropriate box

> 7.25  
Probably not at risk

> 6.5 – 7.25  
Indeterminate  
Stream may be at risk

< 6.5  
Stream at risk

Surveyor (signed): *John Brophy*

Name (print): JOHN BROPHY

Date: 2 / 10 / 2023

**Figure A4:** SSRS score sheet page 2 at downstream (d/s) site on the Cloneymeach River, Summerhill, Co. Meath.



**BEC Consultants Ltd.**  
65 Holywell, Dundrum,  
Dublin 14, D14 P5W0

**Email:** [info@botanicaenvironmental.com](mailto:info@botanicaenvironmental.com)

**Web:** [www.botanicaenvironmental.com](http://www.botanicaenvironmental.com)

