

Norfolk Boreas Offshore Wind Farm

Consultation Report

Appendix 13.16 Minutes of meeting with BP Shipping (15th May 2017)

Applicant: Norfolk Boreas Limited
Document Reference: 5.1.13.16
Pursuant to APFP Regulation: 5(2)(q)

Date: June 2019
Revision: Version 1
Author: Copper Consultancy

Photo: Ormonde Offshore Wind Farm

This page is intentionally blank.

Introduction

A meeting was held at BP's Canary Wharf offices on the 15th May 2017. The objective of the meeting was to discuss the Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Wind Farm project with BP Shipping, who were identified as a regular operator within the area surrounding the proposed project sites.

Attendees

| Attendee | Position | Company/Organisation |
|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| ██████████ (JC) | Marine Superintendent | BP Shipping |
| ██████████ (JA) | Environmental Manager | BP Shipping |
| Capt. Mike Vanstone (MV) | Marine Consultant | Vattenfall |
| Ali MacDonald (AMcD) | Principal Risk Analyst | Anatec Ltd |

Minutes

A summary of the meeting, including key notes, is given below:

1. AMcD presented an overview of the project developments, schedule and the approach to shipping and navigation. The results of the marine traffic surveys undertaken to date were also presented.
2. JC commented that he was surprised the MCA have agreed to a 1nm spacing between the DR1 Light Buoy DWR and the sites, given that the authorities have insisted on a 2nm obstacle free buffer zone in the Netherlands. AMcD stated that this had been looked at and the lower density of shipping was a major factor in this decision.
3. JC stated that transboundary issues should be considered and that the Dutch authorities and relevant Dutch stakeholders consulted. AMcD stated that relevant users and the Dutch authorities will be consulted (**Action 1**).
4. JC stated that coastal vessels will have to follow the DWR as they will no longer be able to cross it, therefore reducing their routing options. AMcD noted that Anatec had made efforts to both identify and consult with users in the area.
5. BP are very interested in the cumulative impact of both the Vattenfall and the Scottish Power projects. AMcD mentioned the previous Southern North Sea Offshore Wind Farm Work which was jointly carried out by developers. An update to this would be preferred so that they can understand the overall impact based on the planned developments. AMcD acknowledged that based on the time elapsed, the previous study was now outdated. This will be discussed with Vattenfall (**Action 2**).
6. Decommissioning of offshore platforms in the area was discussed and it was noted that this will have an impact on the shipping numbers in the area which will require to be considered further within the NRA process. AMcD asked BP if they had any thoughts as to their decommissioning plans for any of their oil fields by 2025, or any projections for the associated increase in the numbers of vessels (**Action 3**).

7. JC and JA expressed concerns with respect to oil spill risk in the area increasing with the wind farms, and to emergency response in the event of a drifting vessel and a potential oil spill clean-up operation in the Southern North Sea. MV explained that discussions were taking place with respect to oil spill response and AMcD explained that an Emergency Response and Cooperation Plan (ERCoP) will be developed for the wind farm post consent (pre-operation), similar to that already in place for other offshore wind farms.

Post meeting note: JC suggested (via email correspondence) opening a dialogue with Oil Spill Response Ltd (OSRL), who will have an idea where the Tier 2 and 3 OS inventories are stored and could assist with developing contingency plans for deployment of higher Tier OS resources

8. JC queried as to if consideration would be given to multicals being modified to have response kit installed.
9. The Norfolk Vanguard hazard log (a draft version created for consultation purposes) was discussed. JC and JA stated that in addition to the most likely and worst case scenarios presented in the log, a “middle ground” case should also be considered. JC and JA also stated they were expecting the allision and collision risks to be higher than they were classified in the log. AMcD explained that the highest risk events will be quantified and assessed in more detail within the NRA.
10. JC stated that vessels may struggle to maintain course when the wind farm is on the Lee side, particularly if the vessel is in ballast. This is based on JC’s own experience of routeing in this area where vessels encounter various weather conditions, and route accordingly using the banks for shelter.
11. JC stated that vessel masters will require to be more vigilant if passing adjacent to the wind farms similar to when entering/leaving port.
12. With respect to the marine traffic surveys, both JC and JA considered the September survey to be Autumn rather than Summer. AMcD explained the MCA had approved the survey dates as seasonal, given that there is not a lot of recreational traffic in the area. It was also noted that longer term AIS data is available for the area from the met masts.
13. JC and JA stated they would like to see representation at a hazard workshop from coasters who will be impacted more directly by the developments. In particular, they would like to see a hazard workshop held for Norfolk Boreas, with relevant users in attendance. BP will discuss this with the Chamber of Shipping (**Action 4**).
14. JC commented on the volumes of the routes within the DWR, in particular that he did not expect them to be so low. AMcD stated that this would be checked using different surveys as a way of validation of the presented vessel numbers (**Action 5**).
15. JC stated that with respect to risk mitigation measures, consideration should be given to amending the existing routeing measures with perhaps the introduction of a separation zone.
16. JA requested that the impacts of construction and operational traffic are considered within the NRA, to ensure the potential interactions from increased traffic levels with the existing traffic are assessed during both the construction and operational phases.

17. JC/JA stated that their vessels may require to reduce speed when they go through the area to have greater maneuverability. This will involve switching from oil to lighter fuels, which will result in an increase in emissions and hence costs.
18. JC stated that the overall risk management of shipping in the area from a cumulative perspective should be assessed within the NRA. This should include consideration of vessel monitoring, the existing routing measures, lighting and marking etc.

Actions

1. Anatec will continue to include Dutch authorities and stakeholders within their consultation for Norfolk Vanguard.
2. Anatec will discuss an approach to cumulative assessment with Vattenfall, given that the Southern North Sea Offshore Wind Farm Work jointly carried out by the relevant developers is now outdated.
3. BP will provide Anatec with information on any relevant decommissioning plans, and associated projected increases in vessel numbers, if such information is available and able to be shared.
4. BP will discuss attendance of relevant users to future hazard workshops with the Chamber of Shipping.
5. Anatec will use previous survey analysis work to validate the estimated vessel numbers using the DWRs in the vicinity of Norfolk Vanguard.