



22. 09. 2016

Brussels,  
ENV.E.3/AV/ai/CHAP(2015)2239

Mr William O' Connor

william.oconnor@ecofact.ie  
info@olddrivershannon.com

Dear Mr O' Connor,

**Subject: CHAP (2015)2239 complaint regarding the Mulkear LIFE Project in Ireland**

First of all I would like to say that we appreciate your continued interest in the conservation status of the Lower Shannon/Mulkear River and of the fish species inhabiting it. We have carefully reviewed your letter of 8 August 2016 in response to our letter of 27 June 2016 informing you of our analysis of your complaint and of our intention to close your file CHAP(2015)2239. After having assessed your additional information, I must maintain that we do not have any ground to further pursue your complaint for the following reasons:

- The project is considered to have delivered the results and achieved its objectives by its end date of 31 December 2014 as foreseen in the relevant Grant Agreement. In this respect it is worthwhile mentioning that implementation of LIFE Nature project has to fit into the timeframe and budget of the project where the emphasis is on concrete conservation actions and monitoring is usually limited to observing the impact of these actions without entering into significant research efforts. Please note that after a project ends we are not in a position to request – beyond the general expectation of maintenance of project results - any additional works to be carried out with the exception of the maintenance of equipment and infrastructure put in place using LIFE funds.
- As regards the lamprey passes installed in the framework of the project, the original action was to retrofit/ install two lamprey passes on 2 weirs. This was done at Annocotty Weir, where 2 passes were installed, and at Ballyclough Weir. The two passes at Annocotty were damaged in floods but only one was replaced as this was the principle one being used by lamprey. The Ballyclough Weir lamprey pass was ultimately removed following the partial removal of the weir itself allowing free migration of lamprey. The current passage possibilities can therefore be considered to be adequate.
- As regards the role and views of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) in relation to this project, we can confirm that they were directly co-financing the project activities and were fully supporting it as competent authority. Furthermore

as stated before, NPWS was a member of the project Advisory (Steering) Group and was therefore aware of all actions planned/performed.

- Finally, the Grant Agreement reflected the views of the project partners that any negative impacts (such as river disturbance) of project actions would be temporary and offset by the positive outcomes and impacts on habitats and species in the long term.

We hope you share this view and consider that the overall impact of the project has resulted in the improved conservation status of both this Natura2000 site as well as the species living there. On the basis of our abovementioned conclusions, I will proceed to closing your complaint.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Paul Speight". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Paul Speight