

File Name: **ISH 10 - 20th July 2022 (Part 3) - Transcript**

File Length: 00:11:43

**FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)**

**00:00:08:15 - 00:00:44:28**

Okay. If we can continue and resume the hearing, we're going to agenda item six, which relates to trade sampling, characterization and contamination analysis and ongoing monitoring. The first point is the sampling characterization and analysis of sediments, and particularly in relation to most earlier concerns. DEADLINE Friday in response to those queries from the MMO. The applicant confirmed that the samples collected for contaminant analysis were acquired from the seabed surface using a mini hem and grab hadn't set zero metres depth.

**00:00:45:21 - 00:01:13:06**

I believe the applicants also detailed the laboratories that had completed the contaminant analysis and the particle size analysis. And Mr. McGovern, I understand you believe that all of the contractors that you've used are validated by the MMO and that you've sent this information in the prescribed format to the MMO ahead of deadline five. As such, do you believe that all of the outstanding queries and concerns are addressed and that the MMO should now be in a position to comment on your results.

**00:01:14:12 - 00:01:16:22**

Can recover from that? Yes, that's correct, sir.

**00:01:18:19 - 00:01:29:28**

In which case the MMO. Now, do you have all of the information that you need on baseline sampling, characterization, analysis of sediments and have all of your outstanding concerns been addressed?

**00:01:31:08 - 00:02:08:01**

The I Williamson for the Alamo. I'll keep my camera off for the remainder of this hearing just to try and save my Internet issues. But I can confirm that the applicant has addressed most of our comments regarding this. However, one remains outstanding, which is the laboratory that carried out the particle size analysis. This is not currently an MMO validated laboratory. It's called guideline. We're not aware of any applications currently in by the laboratory to be validated, and

it can be quite a lengthy process. If the developer is aware of something that has been submitted for validation, they might need to check on the progress of the application or provide us with the application case code so we can see where that is at.

**00:02:09:00 - 00:02:11:01**

But other than that, our concerns are addressed.

**00:02:12:05 - 00:02:17:07**

And Kim and Mr. Governments are. I think further to add on that one is this one outstanding point for you to look out.

**00:02:18:09 - 00:02:24:28**

Kind of for the applicant. And we'll take that one last point on from as quickly as we can.

**00:02:26:08 - 00:02:28:18**

Hopefully you'll be able to get that to as per deadline six.

**00:02:29:13 - 00:02:30:24**

We'll certainly endeavour to do so.

**00:02:31:09 - 00:02:34:08**

It would be nice to get one of these written concluded.

**00:02:35:24 - 00:02:36:26**

Can we be more, sir?

**00:02:38:01 - 00:02:43:19**

Can we move to the second issue, which is the ongoing monitoring of sediment samples?

**00:02:45:09 - 00:02:57:03**

So, Mr. Gavin, from your response to our further written questions, it looks as though you are still awaiting advice from their memo on the required frequency of monitoring of sediments during construct. Is that correct?

**00:02:59:17 - 00:03:09:25**

Connor McGovern for the hour. Yes, that's correct, sir. We hadn't received advice owing to the issues that we've just been discussing. So we thought we had members position on the frequency of monitoring.

**00:03:11:00 - 00:03:30:29**

And I've seen suggestions, I think, of either five years or three years, which I think depends on the particular circumstances. And we do appreciate your proposed construction period, obviously less than five years. Am I is there anything else we can say today to move this towards some sort of conclusion? And then can you provide any clarity about the required frequency of monitoring?

**00:03:32:08 - 00:04:05:05**

The one Williamson for the Marine Management Organization, in light of our position on the accredited laboratory, is we are unable to comment on the actual analysis at present once we can. It depends on the level of contaminants as to whether it's three or five years. So higher levels of contamination result in a three year sample plan or sampling requirement. Any lower results are a five year. We have reviewed the applicant's position at deadline five, a proposal for us to manage in the construction project, Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan.

**00:04:05:24 - 00:04:45:13**

I'll just caveat that we are looking into that and if it was to be pursued, it would need to be clearly outlined that it it's for Austar and I can confirm, as the applicant has indicated in my deadline five, that we are referring to the full wording here, the guidelines for the management of dredged material. So once we've got the accredited laboratory sorted out, we can advise further on the regime for sampling that we require. The applicant also requested clarity on other projects to have this sort of condition and I just indicate condition 30 with East within East Anglia to DMO, which is schedules 13 and 14, and that is where sampling requirements have been specifically outlined.

**00:04:45:15 - 00:04:54:25**

So as long as we capture them in some way, there is manoeuvrability on how we condition them, but we need them to step very clearly and in line with the analysis. Once we are able to review that.

**00:04:58:14 - 00:05:08:14**

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Williamson. Mr. McGovern. Sounds like an opportunity for two for the price of one, if you can sort out your validation. I have.

**00:05:09:04 - 00:05:31:20**

I'm always pleased. Well, there's a possibility of a two for the price of one, so I will certainly look at that. Just to clarify the issue and release the guidelines on whether or not the validity relates solely to the particle size analysis and not the contaminant analysis. We do not believe that should be a reason to hold up the advice from the MMO on the contaminant analysis side of things. Okay. Thank you.

**00:05:31:22 - 00:05:34:05**

Okay. Mr. Williamson. Just anything further on that?

**00:05:37:02 - 00:05:54:26**

William Smillie Management Organisation. I will request from all specialists whether they're able to do. I think it's more to do with the full suite of confirmed laboratories to enable our confidence in the data. But I will push that to much advice to see if that's something we can get the ball rolling on sooner. Had a vacation from the outcome.

**00:05:56:04 - 00:06:07:16**

That would be great if you could do that and if you could liaise with the applicant on that. It sounds to me like we're not very far apart in some of these. Things like this could be quite easily solved. Be something. We'd be grateful if you could progress.

**00:06:09:26 - 00:06:11:12**

Anything else, Mr. McGovern, on that one.

**00:06:14:21 - 00:06:15:15**

No, sir, thank you.

**00:06:16:12 - 00:06:31:22**

Which case can we move on to? The third section of this, which is the responses to the applicant's clarification note on trailer risings and positive sediments, which came into examination at deadline five.

**00:06:34:15 - 00:06:43:18**

We've seen that. Obviously, we've read it. I believe it concludes no significant facts and it does provide us with some reasoning behind that conclusion.

**00:06:45:07 - 00:07:04:18**

Natural England indicated a headline five. They hadn't been able to review the document, and as far as I'm aware, there had been no change on that. But that's, again, something we need to check with the information that came in last night. I will need to ask Natural England for a response on that as necessary.

**00:07:06:05 - 00:07:14:14**

And does the MMO have anything? Has it been able to see this report and has anything to add on the clarification note on really arising deposited sediments?

**00:07:16:03 - 00:07:30:23**

Williamson for MMO. Now we note our comments on the matter have been addressed by the applicant and as captured were not in the report. So we'll just await natural England's comments and we'll provide any updates if applicable in writing. Next up on.

**00:07:31:27 - 00:07:32:23**

Thank you very much.

**00:07:39:10 - 00:07:43:19**

Is there anything else for agenda item six on sediment matters?

**00:07:47:11 - 00:08:06:24**

The next item on the agenda was to do with rock protection, maximum designed scenario. I believe we covered that earlier under the DCO issue specific hearing. But does anybody have any further matters to discuss today on maximum design scenarios and or the rock protection anti-Semitic bank?

**00:08:12:09 - 00:08:28:18**

I don't see any fans, so we will assume we have dealt with that in its fullness. And that takes us on to agenda item eight, which is any other business. I have no other business. And so anything else anybody wishes to raise in relation to today's agenda?

**00:08:31:14 - 00:08:35:02**

Okay. That's from the Marine Management Organization. Sorry.

**00:08:35:17 - 00:08:36:17**

That's Kate Carey.

**00:08:36:20 - 00:09:08:21**

Very brief, briefly and hopefully a point of clarification that we welcomed. We will be speaking to the line six as well. But just for the interest of the examiner, we can confirm that the Dogger Bank, A and B export cable corridor is not an open disposal site currently. So previously in examination, we've seen Home Depot project remove their cable corridor from that designated disposal site application due to the issue of having overlapping disposal sites that are open. This is no longer a concern and we would support the re implementation of this area as a disposal site for Hornsea Project four.

**00:09:09:05 - 00:09:12:09**

This will allow for the retention of sediment within the point system.

**00:09:14:12 - 00:09:14:27**

Thank you.

**00:09:15:06 - 00:09:16:24**

And that is everything for me. Thank you.

**00:09:17:11 - 00:09:21:29**

Thank you very much, Mr. McGovern. It sounds like you may have to go back under.

**00:09:24:00 - 00:09:26:29**

Redo some of the work to give yourself a larger disposal area.

**00:09:28:10 - 00:09:36:17**

Gary McGovern for the applicant. Yes, we were aware of that already, sir, and we'd already replaced that as part of our deadline five submission to that's been addressed.

**00:09:37:08 - 00:09:38:09**

Okay. Thank you very much.

**00:09:41:25 - 00:10:01:07**

In which case we're down to two action points. Mr. Jones has made a complete list of action points. We need to decide how we deal with natural England's action points in the light of reading last night's material. But we will be issuing them with some action points and others which we will publish as soon as we can tomorrow.

**00:10:02:25 - 00:10:06:01**

In which case I'm just going to hand over to Mr. MacArthur to close the hearing.

**00:10:09:02 - 00:10:41:21**

Thank you, Mr. Mullen. If there are no other items that are relevant to this hearing, may I remind you that the examination timetable requires parties to provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline six, which is Wednesday, the 27th of July 2022. May I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Inspectorate's website as soon as practicable after this hearing. The next virtual event for this application will be the issue specific hearing, the 11th issue specific hearing for this examination, which will consider marine ornithology.

**00:10:41:24 - 00:11:13:05**

This will be held tomorrow, Thursday, the 21st of July at 9:30 a.m. with the arrangements conference immediately preceding it at 9:15 a.m.. The agenda for this hearing is available on the project page of the National Infrastructure Website. As with previous events held this week, it is worth noting that tomorrow's hearing will not be a continuation of today's team session and that you will need to log into that event using the specific link provided by the case team. Before we close, we'd like to thank everybody who participates at State for their time and assistance during this hearing.

**00:11:13:21 - 00:11:22:07**

We will consider your responses carefully, and they will inform our decision as to whether the examining authority still requires further information related to any topic covered today.

**00:11:23:24 - 00:11:34:14**

The time is now 11:46 a.m. and I'm closing this issue specific hearing about marine processes and equality, excluding ornithology. Thank you all.