



The Sizewell C Project

9.116 Sizewell C Desalination Plant Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment

Revision: 2.0
Applicable Regulation: Regulation 5(2)(q)
PINS Reference Number: EN010012

October 2021

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed
Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	Project overview	1
1.2	Project Scope.....	2
2	GHG ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	4
2.1	Temporary Desalination Plant GHG Assessment	4
3	ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS	6
3.2	Product carbon emissions	6
3.3	Transportation of construction materials and equipment.....	7
3.4	Waste produced during construction	8
3.5	Construction Activities	8
3.6	Operational Energy Usage	8
3.7	Operational Waste	9
4	RESULTS.....	10
4.1	Desalination Plant GHG Assessment Results Summary	10
4.2	Indicative Change to the Overall Sizewell C Project's GHG Construction Emissions.....	11
	REFERENCES.....	12

TABLES

Table 2.1:	Desalination plant GHG assessment.....	10
Table 4.2:	Indicative change to the Sizewell C Project's GHG assessment with GHG emissions from the desalination plant	11

APPENDICES

None provided.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project overview

1.1.1 This report provides an addendum to the Sizewell C Project Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment with reference to the following documents submitted with the Application:

- **Volume 2, Chapter 26** of the ES [[APP-342](#)];
- **Volume 1, Chapter 2** of the **First ES Addendum** [[AS-181](#)]; and
- **Volume 3, Appendix 9A (Carbon Focused Life Cycle Assessment of the Proposed Sizewell C Nuclear Power Plant Development)**, submitted as part of the Responses to the ExA's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [[REP2-110](#)] (hereafter referred to as the 'updated Carbon LCA report').

1.1.2 This GHG report sets out to quantify the supplementary carbon impact of a proposed temporary desalination plant in the broader context of the Sizewell C Project's previous GHG assessments listed above. As described briefly below, there are some differences in calculation approach relative to the carbon focused LCA – but these would not be expected to have a material impact on the estimated GHG emissions.

1.1.3 The assessment has been undertaken in response to question CC.3.4 of the Examining Authority's third written questions and is indicative based on currently available data.

1.1.4 The proposed desalination plant comprises a temporary modular unit installed at the main development site with intake and outfall connections into the North Sea.

1.1.5 Revision 2.0 of this report implements amendments based on feedback from the Examining Authority after the Issue Specific Hearing 15, held on 5 October 2021. These amendments address the inconsistencies in assumptions identified between the first version of this report and the desalination plant air quality impact assessment report (Doc Ref. 9.117(A)).

1.1.6 As such, the assessment presented within this report has been updated on the basis of the following worst-case assumptions:

- Extending the assumed operational time frame of the desalination facility from 4.65 years up to 8 years (between 2024 and 2032).
- Extending the assumed operational time scale of the diesel-powered generator providing electricity to the desalination plant in Phase 1 from 244 days to 731 days. The diesel-fuelled generator will then be subsequently replaced by an electrical transmission connection for a forecasted period of 2,191 days.
- Amending the GHG calculations based on the increase in operational HGVs, operational materials used, operational energy consumption and operational waste produced.

1.2 Project Scope

1.2.1 The GHG impact assessment includes emissions associated with the following:

- All direct GHG emissions arising from the construction and operation of the temporary desalination plant.
- Indirect emissions associated with electricity use during operation of the temporary desalination plant.
- Indirect emissions embedded within construction materials arising from the energy used in their production.
- Emissions arising from the transportation of materials, waste and operational waste.

a) Eliminated Lifecycle Stages from the Project Scope

1.2.2 Land clearance, worker transport, enabling waste and operational staff have already been accounted for within the scope of the previous GHG assessments [[APP-342](#), [AS-181](#), [REP2-110](#)] and, therefore, do not require further quantification as part of this report. Therefore, these aspects of the carbon assessment have been discounted from this assessment.

1.2.3 At the end of the operation of the temporary desalination plant, the intake and outfall tunnels would be grouted and left in-site, and the modular desalination plant would be removed. Hence, the GHG impact of decommissioning is estimated to have negligible GHG implications. Thus,



SIZEWELL C PROJECT –
DESALINATION PLANT
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS ASSESSMENT

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

the decommissioning phase of the project has not been included in the carbon assessment in this report.

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

2 GHG ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

2.1 Temporary Desalination Plant GHG Assessment

2.1.1 The GHG impact assessment followed a project lifecycle approach to calculate estimated GHG emissions arising from the construction and operation of the temporary desalination plant. The GHG impact assessment identified GHG ‘hotspots’ (i.e. emissions sources likely to generate the largest amount of GHG emissions), which enabled the identification of priority areas for mitigation in line with the principles set out in IEMA guidance (Ref.1).

2.1.2 In line with the World Resources Institute (WRI) & World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) GHG Protocol (Ref.2), the GHG impact assessment is reported as tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO_{2e}) and includes the seven Kyoto Protocol gases:

- Carbon dioxide (CO₂).
- Methane (CH₄).
- Nitrous oxide (N₂O).
- Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆).
- Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs).
- Perfluorocarbons (PFCs).
- Nitrogen trifluoride (NF₃).

2.1.3 Where possible, DEFRA 2021 emissions factors (Ref. 3) and embedded carbon emissions factors from the Inventory of Carbon and Energy (ICE, v3) (Ref.4) were used to estimate the GHG emissions. In circumstances where the DEFRA 2021 or ICE v3 GHG emissions factors were not applicable, other suitable carbon emission factors have been applied, and the emissions factors used are described below.

2.1.4 At this stage, the carbon focused LCA has not been updated to include the desalination plant as the time required to do so (including updating the calculation, report and undergoing the verification process) would not be possible in the short amount of time this addendum has been prepared. As

a result, there are differences in the data sources and calculation method relative to the LCA. These would be expected to give rise to a small difference in the estimated carbon emissions – but would not have a material impact on the outcome. In short, the input data (for materials, energy etc) would be the same and the emissions factors used for each of these inputs would be similar to those provided by the sources above. As the conclusion to this addendum shows, the estimated GHG emissions of the desalination plant are negligible relative to the estimated total construction and lifecycle emissions of Sizewell C.

3 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

3.1.1 The assumptions made in this assessment are set out in Sections 3.2 to 3.7 by emissions source, including:

- Product carbon emissions
- Transportation of construction materials and equipment
- Waste produced during construction
- Construction Activities
- Operational Energy Usage
- Operational Waste

3.2 Product carbon emissions

3.2.1 The estimated product material data have been used to inform the carbon calculations. The product carbon emissions calculations have made the following assumptions:

- Reusable items and materials were not included in the embodied carbon calculations as it was assumed these are temporary materials and will be reused after construction.
- A market average aggregate emissions factor identified from the ICE Database (v3) has been applied, assuming a mixture of 64.2% land won, 27.5% recycled and secondary, and 8.3% marine aggregates.
- For all concrete, the emissions factor from the ICE Database (v3) for 'Concrete – General' has been applied.
- For steel, the world average emissions factor from the ICE Database (v3) for 'steel sections' has been applied.
- For the plastic piping, the ICE Database (v3) emissions factor for 'HDPE pipe' has been applied.

3.3 Transportation of construction materials and equipment

3.3.1 For the carbon emissions calculations for transportation of construction materials and equipment, the following assumptions have been made:

- For all transportation deliveries, previous assumptions about the distance travelled, type of vehicle, and materials and equipment weight was applied from the updated Carbon LCA report [\[REP2-110\]](#). for each transport mode. Based on the new operational time frame of 8 years (previously 4.65 years) the number of HGVs has been recalculated based on the previous assumptions discussed above.
- For the aggregates material, it was assumed 10,009 tonnes of material was delivered to the site via rail by eight trains travelling a distance of 50km.
- For the concrete material, it was assumed 8 HGVs delivered 352 tonnes of material travelling an individual one-way distance of 70km. Also, it was assumed 880 tonnes of material was delivered by train travelling an assumed distance of 70km.
- For steel, it was assumed 213 tonnes of material was delivered by 9 HGVs travelling a one-way distance of 250km.
- For the HDPE pipes, it was assumed that 137 tonnes of material were delivered by 7 HGVs travelling a one-way distance of 200km.
- The DEFRA 2021 emission factor for diesel articulated lorries >33t + ¹well-to-tank emissions (WTT) emissions was applied for delivering construction materials via HGVs.
- The DEFRA 2021 emission factor for all diesel HGVs was used + WTT emissions for the delivery of equipment via HGVs.
- The DEFRA 2021 emission factor for Freight Train + WTT emissions was used for the delivery of materials via train.

¹ The Well-to-Tank emissions factor is also known as upstream or indirect emissions, is an average of all the GHG emissions released into the atmosphere from the production, processing and delivery of a fuel or energy vector

3.4 Waste produced during construction

3.4.1 No waste data was available for the construction period, so the following assumptions have been made:

- A 5% wastage rate has been applied to construction materials to estimate construction waste quantities.
- Based on the previous GHG assessments (as referenced in Section 1.1.1), it has been assumed that 10% of waste will go to landfill (according to the KPIs), and 90% of the waste will go for recycling.
- DEFRA 2021 carbon emissions factors have been applied for the recycling and landfill calculations.

3.5 Construction Activities

3.5.1 Data on estimated fuel consumption for the construction activities has been used within the assessment. The construction activities assumptions are summarised below:

- The DEFRA 2021 emissions factor for Gas Oil (red diesel) + WTT has been applied for diesel use on site.

3.6 Operational Energy Usage

3.6.1 Data regarding energy usage, fuel usage and substance usage was used to inform the carbon calculations. For the operational energy carbon emissions calculations, the following assumptions have been made:

- The DEFRA 2021 emissions factor for Gas Oil (red diesel) + WTT has been applied for diesel use on site. In revision 01 of this report, the assumed operational time frame of the diesel-powered generator has been increased to 731 days.
- The Green Book Commercial / Public sector projected estimates for electricity usage were used (Ref.5). For phase two, a weighted average projected emissions factor was applied between January 2026 and January 2032.
- For the substances used during the process, carbon emission factors from DEFRA were not available, so other suitable sources were identified, including sodium hydroxide (ASTEE (2011) (Ref. 6), sodium

bisulphite (ASTEE (2012) (Ref.7), Ferric Sulphate (University of Manchester (2011) (Ref.8) and Anionic Polyelectrolyte (ASTEE (2012). In revision 01 of this report, the quantities of substances used have increased to reflect the extended operational period of 8 years.

- No emissions factors were identified for the following substances sodium hypochlorite, phosphate, citric acid, DBNPA and peracetic acid. Therefore, carbon embodiment calculations were not determined. However, as there are only small quantities of these chemicals, their exclusion is not anticipated to have a material impact on the overall outcome of the assessment.

3.7 Operational Waste

3.7.1 Data relating to estimated operational waste quantities were accounted for within the assessment, including approximately 40,908 tonnes of dewatered cake sludge and 672m³ of Clean in Place (CIP) hazardous wastewater. For the operational waste carbon emissions calculations, the following assumptions have been made:

- It has been assumed the dewatered cake sludge waste cannot be recycled due to its high saline and mineral content. Since there are no suitable Defra or ICE emissions factors, the 'Water Treatment Works - Sludge to landfill' emissions factor from the UKWIR carbon accounting workbook has been applied (Ref.9).
- It is assumed the hazardous Clean in Place (CIP) wastewater will need to be disposed of offsite. However, since there are no suitable Defra or ICE emissions factors, a fossil liquid waste carbon factor has been calculated using the methodology presented in Chapter 5 of the IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (vol 5) report (Ref.10). The hazardous CIP wastewater is assumed to be solvent-based with a fossil content of 80%.
- Based on the new operational time frame of 8 years, the dewatered cake sludge and CIP wastewater have been recalculated the latest version of this report.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Desalination Plant GHG Assessment Results Summary

4.1.1 The temporary desalination plant GHG assessment results are summarised in **Table 2.1**.

Table 4.1: Desalination plant GHG assessment

Lifecycle stage	Project activity/emissions source	tCO ₂ e	% of total emissions
Construction	Products	877	1%
	Energy consumption/plant fuel use	1,488	3%
	HGV Transport	144	<1%
	Waste	<1	<1%
	Construction Subtotal	2,510	
Operation (over 8 no. years)	Energy consumption / plant fuel use	8,505	10%
	Waste	71,941	87%
	Operation Subtotal	80,445	
	Total	82,956	

4.1.2 The carbon hotspots associated with the desalination plant are predominantly concentrated around the operational phase (97% of total emissions). Waste is the most significant contributor to the total emissions (87%). However, it is considered that the waste quantities and associated emissions during the operation of the desalination plant are likely to be an overestimate and present a worst-case assessment. This is because the operation of the desalination plant at full capacity at all times has been assumed for the purposes of this calculation, which will not be the case in practice.

4.1.3 Furthermore, SZC Co. is committed to reviewing options for the re-use of the dewatered sludge cake generated by the desalination plant, in order to reduce GHG emissions.

4.2 Indicative Change to the Overall Sizewell C Project’s GHG Construction Emissions

4.2.1 **Table 4.2** presents the GHG emissions from the proposed desalination plant within the context of the construction emissions calculated within the updated Carbon LCA report [[REP2-110](#)].

Table 4.2: Indicative change to the Sizewell C Project’s GHG assessment with GHG emissions from the desalination plant

Sizewell C Project GHG Assessment [REP2-110]				
Lifecycle stage	Desalination Plant total tCO _{2e}	Carbon focused LCA total tCO _{2e}	Revised total tCO _{2e} with desalination plant	Percentage increase
Construction	82,956	3,830,194	3,913,150	2.2%
Total lifetime	82,956	9,575,486	9,658,442	0.9%

4.2.2 The indicative emissions estimate from the desalination plant represents 2.2% of the total construction GHG emissions from the Sizewell C carbon focused LCA calculation and 0.9% of the total lifetime GHG emissions from the Sizewell C carbon focused LCA calculation. This indicates that the desalination plant has a negligible impact on the overall construction and lifecycle GHG emissions of the Sizewell C Project.

REFERENCES

1. IEMA Principles Series: Climate Change Mitigation & EIA
<https://www.iema.net/assets/templates/documents/climate20change20mitigation20and20eia.pdf>
2. 25 WRI & WBCSD (2004) The GHG Protocol, A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard
<https://ghgprotocol.org/sites/default/files/standards/ghgprotocol-revised.pdf>
3. DEFRA (2021) Carbon Emissions Factors
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2021>
4. ICE 2019 V3 database <https://www.ice.org.uk/knowledge-and-resources/briefing-sheet/embodied-energy-and-carbon>
5. GOV, Green Book supplementary guidance: valuation of energy use and greenhouse gas emissions for appraisal:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/valuation-of-energy-use-and-greenhouse-gas-emissions-for-appraisal>
6. ASTEE (2011) Methodology guide for evaluating greenhouse gas emissions by water and sanitation services - CO₂ equivalent emission factors - excluding transport
7. ASTEE (2012) Guide méthodologique d'évaluation des émissions de gaz à effet de serre des services de l'eau et de l'assainissement - 3ème édition Décembre 2012. Annexe 5 - Facteurs d'émissions des produits chimiques - Version no.1. Sheet Feuil1.
8. University of Manchester (2011) Carbon Calculations over the Life Cycle of Industrial Activities (CCalC v2.0 - User guide).
9. UKWIR Carbon Accounting Workbook <https://ukwir.org/Workbook-for-Estimating-Operational-GHG-Emissions-Version-13>
10. 006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories, Volume 5, Waste), Chapter 5 <https://www.ipcc-nggip.iges.or.jp/public/2006gl/vol5.html>