



## Trawsgrifiad Gwrandawriad

<b>Prosiect:</b>	Fferm Wynt Alltraeth Mona
<b>Grandawriad:</b>	Gwrandawriad Mater Penodol 2 (ISH2) – Rhan 3
<b>Dyddiad:</b>	17 Gorffennaf 2024

**Sylwer:** Bwriad y ddogfen hon yw i gynorthwyo Partion â Buddiant, nid yw'n air am air.

Cynhyrchir y cynnwys gan ddefnyddio llais i'r testun deallusrwydd artiffisial ac nid yw'n cael ei olygu. Oherwydd ymarferoldeb Microsoft Teams, mae'r trawsgrifiad yn arbennig o anghywir gyda'r iaith Gymraeg. Peidiwch â dehongli'r cyfieithiadau mor gywir. Mae'r recordiad fideo yn parhau fel prif gofnod y digwyddiad.



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Mona Offshore Wind Farm
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) – Part 3
<b>Date:</b>	17 July 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties; it is not verbatim.

The content is produced using artificial intelligence voice to text and is unedited. Due to the functionality of Microsoft Teams, the transcript is particularly inaccurate with the Welsh language. Please do not interpret the translations as accurate. The video recording remains as the primary record of the event.

### **Mona\_ISH2\_17 July\_PT3**

Created on: 2024-07-17 14:10:37

Project Length: 01:24:18

File Name: Mona\_ISH2\_17 July\_PT3

File Length: 01:24:18

#### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:02 - 00:00:56:19

Okay good afternoon everybody. It's at 130. So we'll we'll resume issues with a hearing to um just before we move into agenda item four, shipping and navigation. Just a couple of points. We would like to come back to the applicant on from this morning. Um, minor points. Really. Um, we were talking about requirement um, 14 and also the information that's in the code of construction practice around mobilization, which occurs an hour before and an hour after they call construction hours. Um, there seems to be a little bit of a contradiction in terms of the wording in requirement 14 and the wording that's in the code of construction practice in that requirement 14 one uh, refers to traffic movements, whereas in your mobilization, um, you have, you know, workers travelling to and from site.

00:00:57:02 - 00:01:05:18

Um, so the traffic movements, obviously it can mean any traffic the way it's worded at the moment. So it's just something that we either ask you or to have a look at.

00:01:07:04 - 00:01:10:10

Lays down on behalf of the applicant. We will look at that and make sure it's clear.

00:01:10:26 - 00:01:44:01

Thank you. And just one more point. And this is really just to give you a bit of advance warning this do um Um,. possibly brought up the, um, the reference to darkness now working outside of darkness. And I know that was something that you were going to go away and have a look at now that that is in, uh, application reference app 069, I think he was referring to that is likely to come up tomorrow under landscape. So it was just to give you that advanced warning. If you are going away and having a look at it, then it would be beneficial for you to look at it before tomorrow.

00:01:44:03 - 00:01:52:18

Thank you. We are looking at that. So we'll we'll hopefully be able to come with a with a clear clearer position on on what was suggested. Okay. Thank you.

00:01:52:24 - 00:01:56:19

Thank you. That's all for me. I'll hand over to Mrs. Powis.

00:01:58:03 - 00:02:35:24

Thank you, Mrs. Jones. Okay, so we're moving on to item four now, which is shipping and navigation. And this item is an exploratory session. So just to check that we're identifying the main issues for the

examination, and also to make sure we're understanding the extent of agreement and disagreement amongst the parties in relation to these issues. And we can see that there's been engagement at the pre-application stage, um, primarily through the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum. And the material before us indicates that there are still some important shipping and navigation matters upon which agreement with the relevant statutory advisers and some industry stakeholders is not as yet been reached.

00:02:36:08 - 00:02:59:19

So we've invited the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and Trinity House to today's hearing, but unfortunately they will not be appearing today. Um, we do have requests to speak on this item from. I'm just going to check that everybody. I think all are attending virtually. So Mr. Mary Liese from the UK Chamber of Shipping. Just checking that you're still on the call or you've come back after lunch. Yep. I can see you, Mr. Bailey.

00:02:59:25 - 00:03:01:02

I'm still here. Thank you.

00:03:01:11 - 00:03:15:06

Thank you. Um. And Mr. Proctor, representing Stena Line limited. Okay. Thank you. Um, Mr. Ennis representing the the Orsted IPPs as we're calling them.

00:03:15:19 - 00:03:16:05

Yes.

00:03:16:27 - 00:03:28:26

Good afternoon, Mr. Ennis. Thank you for listening. Okay, so, um, we will bring you into the discussion. Discussion as we go through. Is there anybody else here who's expecting to speak on shipping and navigation?

00:03:30:20 - 00:03:40:06

Okay. I'm not seeing any further hands. I can see that the applicant has other people at the table. Um, maybe. Would you like to introduce your witness now? Mr..

00:03:40:12 - 00:03:41:11

Thank you. Yes.

00:03:41:13 - 00:03:44:19

Happy to. Um. So, um, as well as Paul.

00:03:44:21 - 00:03:45:09

Carter, who's.

00:03:45:11 - 00:03:48:07

Consent manager, um, for the Mona.

00:03:48:09 - 00:03:55:27

Offshore wind project, and Gerard Vella, who's the, uh, lead, uh, offshore consent lead for the project.

00:03:56:06 - 00:03:56:24

Um, we.

00:03:56:26 - 00:04:00:07

Also have Andrew Rawson, who is an associate director.

00:04:00:09 - 00:04:02:29

From Nash Maritime. Um, and behind.

00:04:03:01 - 00:04:11:17

Him we've got Dominic Bell, who's a principal master mariner. Sorry, from Brooks Bell. They were both involved in the drafting of.

00:04:11:19 - 00:04:12:07

The EOS.

00:04:12:09 - 00:04:13:01

Chapter and have been.

00:04:13:03 - 00:04:14:21

Involved with the Marine and.

00:04:14:23 - 00:04:22:00

Navigation Forum. So if there are specific questions about what's been done, how it's been done, we can bring them into the discussion.

00:04:22:08 - 00:04:53:24

Thank you very much. And welcome, Mr. Lawson. Okay. Um, so the shipping and navigation topic is fairly extensive, and I'm anticipating that we will need to reserve some time in a future issue specific hearing to explore this in more detail in the context of what the national policy statements are asking us to look at, and indeed other legislation and policy. Um, so I think our time today is best used in two main ways. Um, firstly, I'd like to receive some updates from the applicant about the status of agreement with some stakeholders on the shipping and navigation matters.

00:04:53:29 - 00:05:32:03

And then secondly, I'd like to hear submissions from the relevant interested parties who have joined us this afternoon to make best use of their attendance. And that would be the Chamber of Shipping, Stena Line and the Orsted IPPs. So in terms of our agenda for item four will no doubt touch on all of the matters, but I'm not going to be rigid in working through those in order. We're just going to take it as it comes. And I would just say before we kick off, um, take all of the application documents and submissions as read. There's no need to repeat things we already have in writing. Okay. So firstly, then just to come to the applicant, um, so we can see from the technical engagement plan how the applicant has engaged with the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum.

00:05:32:15 - 00:06:03:27

Um, and that document reports, I think it's at table 1.19. The issues that have been agreed and the issues that are still under discussion are just below that. What we don't have is an awful lot of detail in the relevant representations from the key parties. Um, and we don't have, uh, therefore much in terms of response to relevant reps, because we just haven't had detail in the relevant representations on this topic. Um, so I'm sure discussions have continued between the parties, but from our perspective, we don't see much more progress since we haven't seen anything really since the applications come in.

00:06:03:29 - 00:06:27:13

So what we'd like to do first is just come to the applicant and ask whether there's been any progress in discussions with the relevant stakeholders on navigation and shipping matters since the application was submitted. If there's anything specific that he wants to let us know has happened, any progress that has been made? And also just a question about whether that form has continued into this examination stage, whether that was a pre-application form only.

00:06:47:28 - 00:07:07:16

Jerry Vetter for the applicant. I'm taking your second question first regarding the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum. We have made a commitment to continuing that forum, um, beyond the consent decision. So that will extend into pre-construction and the operational phase for the project. Um, in terms of your.

00:07:10:19 - 00:07:39:25

Um, and since submission of the application, we haven't yet had another, uh, marine navigation engagement forum meeting. No, sorry. Um, in terms of your first question, uh, we are engaging with, um, stakeholders that we identified a moderate significant impact against within the application. I don't know if you'd like me to just to give a quick overview of where we got to in terms of, um, the results of the impact assessment.

00:07:42:08 - 00:07:52:00

I think we can take them as read. And when we come to specific IPS, we've got to talk to you. Then I probably will ask you to do that in terms of their interests, rather than repeating what we know is in the is already fine.

00:07:52:02 - 00:07:58:27

Okay. In that case, yes, we have indeed continued engagement with the affected parties on residual matters.

00:08:01:18 - 00:08:21:12

Okay. And then specifically on the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, we don't have them present today. Um, and their relevant representation is quite brief, but obviously we can see that they've been extensively involved at pre-amp. Um, are you able to give a summary, a brief summary of the issues still under discussion with the MCA?

00:08:22:05 - 00:08:32:06

Uh, Chair Vella for the applicant. We did actually have a statement of Common Ground meeting with the MCA on last Friday, which was the.

00:08:34:03 - 00:08:37:15

Probably seemed like a long time ago. 12th of.

00:08:37:18 - 00:09:15:27

July. Um, we made very good progress with that statement of common ground meeting, and we will be intending to submit, um, an initial statement of common ground at deadline one, as requested by the examining authority. And through that meeting, again, not wanting to speak for MCA, but we made very good progress and managed to close out. I think nearly all of the agreement statements within the, um, statement of common ground. I think the key points that the MCA um, took away, because they're still working through our application materials, um, relate to, um, any requirements within the DCA or DML.

00:09:15:29 - 00:09:22:22

And I think with respect to, with respect to um.

00:09:24:22 - 00:09:30:25

Sorry, sorry, I can't remember about 90% is complete though. And an agreed.

00:09:33:25 - 00:09:57:11

List done on behalf of the applicant. I'll just add in that in respect of the requirements and the conditions within the draft development Consent order and the draft marine licence licence we have had regard to those draft both the McKay Trinity House and now have a kind of combined set of conditions, and we've very much had regard to those in terms of how those have been drafted. Um, I know sometimes

00:09:59:06 - 00:10:28:16

there can be a request for some real precision around some of the use of, um, proposed uh, conditions, particularly in the marine licence. Um, as far as the applicant is concerned, we have captured what it is the MCA is looking to achieve through those, um, conditions. But, um, obviously it's subject to confirmation now that they're happy with the versions that have have finally gone into the the marine licence.

00:10:29:17 - 00:10:30:22

Thank you, Mr. Vela.

00:10:30:24 - 00:10:37:23

Thanks for the applicant. Um, the other area that Mackay was still looking at related to, um, search and rescue.

00:10:38:12 - 00:10:40:06

Sorry, could you repeat that? Search and rescue.

00:10:40:08 - 00:10:42:03

Related to search and rescue. Sorry.

00:10:42:05 - 00:10:42:23

Okay.

00:10:44:25 - 00:10:51:07

And is that in relation to the way that you or your assessment outcomes, or is it more about mitigation?

00:10:52:20 - 00:11:06:24

Gerry Vella for the applicant, I think it was. They were still working through the material, so we weren't ready to comment on that. I don't think there's any particular issues that we're expecting. They didn't have the right people. They didn't have the right people on the call.

00:11:07:19 - 00:11:13:15

Thank you very much. That's a very helpful update. I'm going to ask you to do the same, please, in relation to Trinity House.

00:11:38:26 - 00:11:40:18

Jerry Vetter for the applicants.

00:11:42:29 - 00:12:24:29

We had a common ground meeting with Trinity House on the 12th of July. Um, and we have managed to close out nearly all the agreements, with the exception of um, mitigation measures described in um table 1.10 of the navigation risk assessment, which is App 098. Um, they still hadn't worked through that material and reserved um rights in the next meeting to have a look at that. And I believe they also had not yet had an opportunity to have a look at our draft development consent order, and again, wanted to have a look at that with regards to provisions, uh, for the benefit of Trinity House.

00:12:27:01 - 00:12:29:20

Thank you again. Very helpful. Um.

00:12:31:06 - 00:12:55:27

two more I'd just like to look at, um, before we move on, which is firstly the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company because, um, we don't have a relevant representation from them. Um, we've invited and we invited them to the preliminary meeting, which means they now are in other person in this examination so that hopefully they will engage as we go forward. But again, it's kind of radio silence from our perspective. So it'd be really helpful to hear about the status of discussions between yourselves and the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company.

00:12:57:10 - 00:13:35:07

Gerard Vella for the applicant. Um, so so two points here in terms of engagement with Steam Packet directly, we are engaging with them on residual matters. Um, and have had several meetings following submission of the application. Um, we we are also engaging with the Territorial Seas Committee within the Department of Infrastructure on the Isle of Man, who did submit a relevant representation into, uh, into the examination, um, the Territorial Seas Committee, um, and the applicant will be preparing a statement of common ground for submission into the examination.



00:13:35:13 - 00:14:17:26

Uh, they are representing their stakeholders on the island, which includes the Steam Packet Company, which is part of, um, part of the Department of Infrastructure, um, within Manx government. So, so I think we didn't see some some submissions from some Manx stakeholders because the Territorial Seas Committee are taking the lead on doing that, and we have had a meeting with them on the statement of common ground, um, the basis of the document and its objectives, etc., and will be engaging on that, um, hopefully to submit a draft and initial statement of common ground, a deadline one and that will include for um, shipping and navigation and Steam Packet Company as well.

00:14:18:25 - 00:14:47:25

That's extremely helpful. Thank you very much. Um, clearly, in terms of the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company that you there's an identification of, uh, moderate adverse effects to to their, um, their operations. Um, have you. But there are obviously no further mitigations currently, um, identified in the. Yes. And I just wondered whether that's that conversation has ended or whether there's still a discussion going on about whether there might be anything else that might help to reduce those effects.

00:14:48:27 - 00:15:18:09

Uh, Gerard Vella for the applicant. So the the the residual effects are effects on operations increased. Um, um, um routing as a result of diversions around the the, the Mona project. As a result, they relate to things like um impacts on um, increased need, increased uh, fueling requirements and are um, generally commercial in nature. So we're engaging on those, uh, on those matters now.

00:15:24:02 - 00:15:37:12

Okay. Thank you. And then the final one I just wanted to touch on was um, and I may be pronouncing this incorrectly CLN ro ro limited. So we had a relevant representation from them. Is that the correct pronunciation? Out of interest? Yes.

00:15:37:23 - 00:15:43:02

Jerry. Jerry Vella for the applicant. That's correct. And they were formerly si truck Truck..

00:15:43:15 - 00:15:44:01

Aha.

00:15:44:03 - 00:15:45:19

That's formerly si truck. Ro ro.

00:15:45:21 - 00:15:47:22

Then you've just answered most of my questions. Okay.

00:15:50:13 - 00:16:01:23

So at the pre-application, all of the pre-application references to C truck has is KId and same company. Okay. That's very helpful. And so a brief a brief update then please as to where you are with those.

00:16:02:11 - 00:16:16:18

Uh, Jerry Villar for the applicants. Um, we have reached out on a number of occasions to kln to engage on any residual matters. Um, we haven't been successful in securing a meeting.

00:16:28:03 - 00:16:30:28

Uh, Villa for the applicant yet? We'll continue trying.

00:16:33:16 - 00:16:40:15

And how engaged were struck at the pre-application? So were they part of the marine navigation engagement? Actively part of that forum.

00:16:40:25 - 00:17:12:25

All right. Jerry Vella for the applicant. They were part of the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum, um, from its inception. Um, they attended um the bridge simulations that we had at Air Wallingford, um, specifically to, um, investigate, um, their vessels, uh, both British simulations ahead of the preliminary environmental information reports and ones that we undertook following, um, the mitigation commitments that were made by the project.

00:17:13:05 - 00:17:37:06

Um, so and they did attend both the um hazard workshop again, prepare and the hazard workshop. Um, for the application. So there have been involved throughout the pre-application process up until December of last year, um, where we had a meeting, um, post hazard workshop to discuss any residual matters that they had.

00:17:38:06 - 00:18:08:11

Okay. So I think we'll wait to see, uh, if and what we receive from them in the written reports and going forward. We haven't requested a statement of common ground, as you'll be aware. Um, but we will see how those matters play out, I think. Um, I won't take that any further now. Okay. Um, that's been a really helpful update. We talked a bit yesterday about the pre examination progress tracker, which, um, for shipping and navigation, uh, sort of demonstrates that the whole issue.

00:18:08:13 - 00:18:43:25

The issue as a whole is capable of resolution. Um, we've had some useful updates today about where you are, where you see things in terms of your, um, discussions with some of the key parties. Um, so we obviously do have statements of common ground, as we've already touched on from F of deadline, one from MCA, Trinity House, the Chamber of Shipping, who will come to um and again, as you said, the Territorial Sea Committee and NSW to the extent that it's relevant. And then there are a number of parties who are interested in this subject, but we haven't asked for statements of common ground with um, and that includes two of the parties joining us today.

00:18:43:27 - 00:19:06:20

And, um, in those cases, we would just ask those parties to use their written reps at deadline one to set out the main, the main issues, um, and just keep under we'll keep under review whether a statement of common ground is necessary or some kind of, you know, joint statements are really helpful to us as we progress through the examination. If you're able to reach a point where you can say, you know, we're both happy, this is now resolved, that's very helpful to us when it comes to reporting.

00:19:07:20 - 00:19:54:20

Um, Les Dunn, on behalf of the applicant and just sort of picking up a point that's come out in respect of this, and it's probably more about the pre examination tracker where we're not getting engagement with parties. And we haven't got detail for example, in relevant representations. Um, clearly will highlight that we're still trying, but there's only going to be so much we can't make it up for people in terms of. So they may well, you know, our view is this is capable of resolution, but unless we've got tangible material from third parties to be able to comment on and be able to kind of identify those areas of disagreement, um, it's just it's just ensuring that that's understood that, um, that that where we do get detail, it's, it's very helpful for us because actually we can really understand what the nature of the issue is and then start to take steps.

00:19:54:22 - 00:20:00:26

But it's very difficult if we don't have detailed representations from parties so that we can then actually respond to.

00:20:01:15 - 00:20:29:10

Absolutely. And indeed, when it comes to us doing our job of writing a report on this, um, we need really specific information and evidence from parties in order to be able to consider them. Um, okay. So I'm going to suggest, now that we move to invite submissions from the representatives of Stena Line and the UK Chamber of Shipping and the Orsted ships, interested parties. Um, and I think we'll start with Stena Line Limited. So, Mr. Proctor.

00:20:30:28 - 00:20:32:28

Hi. Good afternoon. My first on the line.

00:20:33:17 - 00:20:34:06

Good afternoon.

00:20:34:24 - 00:20:49:21

Give an overview as to where we find ourselves. At the present time, if you can, with me. So sunlight offers six passenger freight trains, passenger and freight on strategic routes. Which transit areas? Sorry, Mr. Proctor, we're not.

00:20:49:23 - 00:21:00:01

We're having slight issues with with the sound quality. So I'm just going to ask you to start again, please, I think. Yeah. If you could just run us through basically the the thrust of your case, that would be very helpful.

00:21:00:08 - 00:21:01:09

Okay. Is that a little better?

00:21:03:13 - 00:21:07:22

Yeah. Just take it slowly because it's not it's not wonderful quality. So yeah. Thank you.

00:21:08:04 - 00:21:46:19

So standalone operates six passenger and freight ferries on three strategic routes between the Isle of Man and the UK mainland. So we're currently looking to manage the response to all four projects, which is across two jurisdictions, the fourth project being the more abandoned project off of the Isle of Man. So as I say, it's something that, uh, came to us quite, uh, in the last couple of years, and we're trying to try to manage that as effectively as we can. At the root, um, which is, uh, affecting us at present with regards to Moana, is that we have a route between Belfast and Liverpool, which is serviced by three vessels.

00:21:47:06 - 00:22:01:12

Two of those are passenger railroads and one is a freighter. Each of the three vessels transits the proposed Moana area twice in a day. So we're looking at six transits in any day, and the service operates 364 days a year.

00:22:03:00 - 00:22:43:26

So what we do have options to transit between the two ports of Belfast and Liverpool by either the north or south of the Isle of Man. There are implications for both routes. The one to the south of the Isle of Man, which transit through transit through the Molyneux development, is probably the one per year at least disturbed. And obviously navigational safety as a as a business is the thing that concerns is the most. But we do have some business case concerns, um, mainly with regards to additional, uh, fuel consumption and the, uh, the lengthening of the passage time between the two ports.

00:22:44:22 - 00:23:14:29

If I can briefly run through the, the navigational safety, um, items. So, uh, I have engaged as a stakeholders with Nash Maritime as represented as the applicant from Q2 and 2021. Since then, we have participated in several marine navigational engagement forums and marine simulations in Air Wallingford and the resulting translated workshops. So this is a process has covered both the original and the reduced red line boundaries for for the all three projects.

00:23:15:15 - 00:23:56:22

And we very much welcomed this um, as a process. Um, and we did find it useful. And while the process did return a residual risk level as being LP or as low as reasonably practicable, um, the people for the majority of the risks identified that even though we have reduced it to or what you might say is a residual risk, it's still above what is the current risk level for ourselves. So we just need to point out that steadily, as the owners of the risk, once the project is developed and that we as the risk owners, we should get to decide what we deem to be an acceptable risk.

00:23:57:19 - 00:24:32:17

And we're very mindful of the fact that two of these ferries has a passenger capacity of a thousand souls on board. So therefore we need to take that very much into account as a very serious item, uh, when we, uh, engage. So if, uh, the residual concerning issues that I would say that we have is really, uh, many of these, I don't know how that they are further mitigated, but the, the, the issues we would have are that the funneling of marine traffic into areas, uh, or reduced seaway.

00:24:33:01 - 00:25:03:03

And this is caused by all the ore development in the area. Um, anticipated additional vessel encounters, particularly at the corners of the various, uh, developments, reduced weather, routing for masters during periods of adverse weather. And, um, I think we can all see from the weather systems that we've experienced over the past couple of years, These can be seen to be more frequent, uh, to, for us to have more notable weather events.

00:25:04:13 - 00:25:59:20

And we're very conscious that the vessels that we we have are very seaworthy. They're large, they're new. Um, uh, but we're also mindful of the fact that the passengers that we carry, um, are do tend to fall, particularly elderly passengers. of which people tend to travel, um, well into old age, and rightly so too. But we also have the issues with cargo freight units, even though it's latched, um, securely to the decks of our passenger Aurora's, the contents of the unit can sometimes shift, which causes an issue for, um, both ourselves and the the the shipper themselves that they are the primary, um, uh, navigational safety issues that we have, obviously, as has been mentioned, but we do have commercial impacts on our business as well.

00:26:00:03 - 00:26:09:10

And if we look at primarily the mono one for now, um, the deviation, uh, might be seen to be relatively small. However.

00:26:09:28 - 00:26:14:22

Before we go on to the commercial side, could we just pause on navigational safety just for a moment? Is that okay?

00:26:15:03 - 00:26:15:18

Absolutely.

00:26:16:11 - 00:26:40:06

Um, just, um, wanted to check. Um, when you're talking about this, are you talking about, um, is it possible to think about the project alone? So the effects of the Moana alone, um, versus the cumulative situation. So you've talked about the four new projects, which I presume is Mona together with Morgan Generation assets, together with Morecambe Generation assets. And then more than in um.

00:26:42:02 - 00:26:46:18

Does your concern relate to the project alone or is it about the cumulative picture.

00:26:47:10 - 00:27:14:04

Which is a major is a major element because it tends to exacerbate each one. Because one feeds to another, each one results in more funding if it was a single or a development. I think the resultant would be less. But even with just one, if we take Moana. Yes, I think there are still, um, challenges from it, from a navigation and safety perspective.

00:27:15:03 - 00:27:35:11

Thank you. That's very helpful. And, um, we hear what you're saying about, um, the the effect, the residual effects basically being above the current baseline in terms of safety as a result of the project

alone. Do you agree with the applicants finding that for the project alone, all the hazards have been reduced to as low as reasonably practicable?

00:27:36:21 - 00:28:00:15

Yes, which we took part in that process. And it was a done by a more of like a scoring process whereby we could, uh, score on uh, the various hazards which were identified. And yes, they have been reduced to IRP, but we must identify that there it's still it's still a risk for the rest of, of the current, uh, the current baseline.

00:28:01:23 - 00:28:12:15

That's very helpful. Thank you. Before we go any further, I'm going to ask the applicant to come back if they'd like to, on any of the points they've just heard on just on navigational safety for Mr. Proctor. Or you can come back to everything at the end if you'd rather.

00:28:19:06 - 00:28:24:11

I cherry Fowler for the applicant. Nothing now, but we would like to come back at the end if necessary.

00:28:24:27 - 00:28:41:28

Okay. Thank you. In that case, Mr. Proctor, then I'm. I'm going to ask you to look at the second part of your submissions, which is about the kind of the effect on commercial operations. So, um, I know, uh, we've seen some of that in your relevant representation, but it would be certainly helpful to hear your elaboration on those points.

00:28:42:27 - 00:29:14:05

Okay, so the, uh, the primary, uh, item is the increase in transit distance between the ports of Belfast and Liverpool. So as I said, while it appears to be quite small, uh, over a long period of time, it does result in a significant cost. So in order for us to maintain a schedule and we're running three vessels on that route. So it's very necessary for the vessels to maintain their schedule. So they don't, as it were, a bunch up in port. So each vessel will be handled in sequence as they pass through each port.

00:29:14:07 - 00:29:57:25

So it's almost like a kind of a conveyor belt of ferries linking the two ports that each Each vessel will have a slot time, and if we tend to find the vessels fall behind for whatever reason, it's going to cause a bunching of the imports, which will be port congestion and various other challenges for the port operation and the the way around it is to increase speed. Obviously, with an increase in speed, there's an increase in fuel consumption. Increased fuel consumption is in an increase in emissions, and we're well aware that the emissions trading system will penalize us for additional and additional emissions and additional fuel usage.

00:29:58:10 - 00:30:35:10

And with that in mind, Stena Line have committed to migrating to a new, greener marine fuels. The one which we have selected for this region is methanol. And unfortunately, this initiative does not come with at no cost implications. Methanol is a is a more expensive fuel with a lesser calorific value. But it's it's part of our green initiative. And we're also conscious of the fact that the the trade, which

we're on at the moment and is a strategic service for Northern Ireland and many of our freight customers work on a just in time model.

00:30:35:14 - 00:30:47:07

And delays to those kind of services, particularly for services into Northern Ireland, are not regarded as being acceptable by them, particularly for more shipping things like like foodstuffs.

00:30:51:13 - 00:30:58:20

Thank you. And just on that just in time point, um, are you able to give an outline of the kind of businesses that rely on your service?

00:30:59:21 - 00:31:30:16

Well, we've, uh, we're our business, thankfully, is building all the time. So we, uh, the two, the two, uh, row of passenger workers on that service were brought into service, uh, less than two years ago, and we're already full. They're a larger ship than they used previously. Uh, the we actually find ourselves in a position now, whether they're actually still too small. We do have two sister ships, which we could quite easily swap out to, to replace those.

00:31:30:22 - 00:31:52:21

Those vessels would give us the additional carrying capacity which we actually need at the moment, which is something which is under review. Bigger vessels tend to require, you know, burn more fuel. So we're conscious of the fact that I need further expansion in our business, and that the additional fuel cost will remain as a significant factor.

00:31:54:17 - 00:31:55:02

Thank you.

00:31:56:18 - 00:31:58:27

Pardon? I said, did I answer your question?

00:31:58:29 - 00:32:11:08

Yes you did. Thank you. And just the final point in your in what we've seen in writing from yourselves, um, there was mention of the effect on bunker consumption and turnaround times. Do you feel you've covered that point sufficiently?

00:32:12:13 - 00:32:47:26

Yeah, we have, as I say, watch the bunker consumption. Even if we didn't change, the methanol would increase. Um, and I say we're very conscious of the fact that, uh, the, um, emissions trading system is going to be, uh, quite punitive for all, uh, shipping operators. So it's something in which we are actively looking to try and mitigate as much as possible. Uh, I mean, by increasing our speed, this is something which would go against everything that we're trying to achieve. We've invested a lot of money in, uh, more streamlined holes and, uh, streamlining the superstructure on the vessels.

00:32:48:00 - 00:33:22:07

The, uh, the propellers in the hull form, the, um, the coating on the outside of the hull is that is a very expensive system that we've put on, but that vastly reduces the the drag to the water. So it's even down

to the, the trim of the vessel, whether it's, um, it's trim or trim. Uh, the, uh, we operate the vessels at their optimum draught, in which case we don't carry any, um, uh, ballast, which will increase the draft of the vessel is obviously an increase of the amount of foam passing through the water.

00:33:22:10 - 00:33:43:09

All these things, uh, you know, will have very, very small effects. But to demonstrate what the, uh, increased cost of each one of these is really very worthwhile. You actually have a department. There's nothing else but but analyzing this type of fuel consumption and ways of making our operation greener.

00:33:45:06 - 00:34:15:26

That's all very useful. Um, and I suppose one thing we're mindful of is that this is a project with a 35 year operational life, and, um, innovations in the shipping industry are, um, no doubt happening. Um, so it's hard to predict what, you know, what changes might be coming anyway in the industry and looking forward in that kind of time frame. And so it sounds like what you're saying in terms of additional steaming time. Um, and you'll have seen I'd imagine that the applicants responded to some of some specifics about additional steaming time.

00:34:15:28 - 00:34:31:21

But it sounds like from what you're saying, that actually, um, it would be a matter of compensate. You would, as a company, be compensating for that by doing things like increasing speed and, um, taking other measures to try and offset that rather than absorbing additional steaming times. Is that correct?

00:34:31:24 - 00:35:02:17

Yes. Well, that would be that would be the worst case scenario if they actually had to. Just as I say, take it on the chin like we're continuing to try new things. Um, most of them are returning very, very small benefits. But even though they return small benefits on a cost day to achieve, it's still, um, a it's better to do that than take the issue of fuel cost. The, um, emissions trading system, you may be aware, operates on a tiered system.

00:35:02:19 - 00:35:24:22

So it's in order to allow shipping operators to, um, manage this over over a period of time. The window is still relatively short, so there's no time to, uh, to delay on this. So you very much are engaged and it's a case of having to engage and having to be successful.

00:35:26:20 - 00:35:34:23

Thank you very much. Um, before I come to the applicant to respond to any of those points, is there anything else that you wanted to raise from Stena Line's perspective?

00:35:35:18 - 00:35:38:25

I think that largely covers what we have to put forward. Thank you.

00:35:41:09 - 00:35:45:13

Okay, then I'll pass it to the applicant to come back on those points.

00:35:52:21 - 00:36:03:16



Jerry Vella for the applicant. Um, nothing really more to come back with other than, as I mentioned earlier, we are engaging with Stena Line and Mr. Proctor on these residual matters.

00:36:05:24 - 00:36:22:00

Okay. Well, that's encouraged for sure as we go forward to certainly, um, support that engagement. I don't think there's anything else from our perspective from. Nope. So I think we'll move on then. Um, and we'll ask Mr. Mary Liese from the UK Chamber of Shipping.

00:36:24:08 - 00:36:25:28

Mr. Merrill is from the UK Chamber of Shipping.

00:36:26:09 - 00:36:44:02

Thank you very much for joining us today. Now, we haven't had a relevant representation from the Chamber of Shipping, and therefore we don't have an applicant's response to anything that you've put in yet. Um, so what I'm going to ask you to do is just start by briefly outlining the Chamber of Shipping's position in relation to the Moana project, please.

00:36:45:10 - 00:37:04:21

Uh, absolutely. Uh. Thank you. In relation to the chamber's, uh, relevant representation, one was submitted, uh, later on due to a clerical error, but for the, uh, the clarity of those around, uh, happy to, uh, go through the salient points of that, um, the clarity of the hearings. Um, chambers thing is.

00:37:04:29 - 00:37:21:19

I will just say that on that, Mr. Murphy. So I think what the way that came in was, is the section 102 a request, which means that it actually hasn't been published and doesn't form part of the examination. It was just a request to join. So just bear that in mind. In terms of, um, what you put in for your written reps as well, because, um, assume we have nothing in writing from you yet.

00:37:22:17 - 00:38:02:21

Absolutely. That's a helpful, uh, point of clarification. Thank you. Um, so the Chamber of Shipping is the trade association for the UK shipping industry. We have some 200 uh, members. Uh, more than in excess of those are in excess of 100. Rather, our ship operators, um, operating 900 or so plus vessels around the UK and globally. Um, we're very much representing the full breadth of the, uh, shipping industry that includes dry and wet trades, i.e. bunkers and tankers, um, passenger transport, uh, cruise and ferry, uh, including the likes of uh of stellar line, um, as well as offshore construction, uh, offshore supply stowage and specialist activity.

00:38:02:25 - 00:38:53:03

Uh, and alongside that, a large raft of professional members who are supportive of uh, the, the UK shipping industry and seeing its its continued, uh, economic success and growth. We're very supportive of the, um, the overall targets and ambition for, um, offshore renewables and particularly offshore wind within the UK, NZ and uh, understanding and supportive of the government's, uh, net zero obligations uh, by 2050. We recognise that the ports and the shipping industries play a vital and very essential role in, um, those targets in terms of providing bases for um, decommissioning, construction, operation and maintenance, as well as um for, for crew transfer vessels and other things during the course of the course of the ori's, uh, existence.

00:38:53:27 - 00:38:54:12

Um.

00:38:54:19 - 00:39:28:25

We're also firm in the sense that the planning framework and process needs to be supportive of, um, the wider shipping industry and, uh, avoid or minimize disruption and economic loss for the shipping and navigation industries, uh, some of which, uh, Mike, uh, Michael Proctor just spoke to there. Um, and and I was actually engaged through the, um, uh, through the Crown Estate, um, and, and other forms to represent that, um, I when there was, of course, particular regard and required for um, strategic routes, uh, and lifeline ferries, those essential to regional, national and international trade.

00:39:29:08 - 00:39:33:06

Um within the relevant chapters of the of the NPS. Um,

00:39:34:26 - 00:40:09:29

I mean points certainly figure around the, uh, the necessity for navigational safety to be upheld, uh, and ensure that, uh, developments are positioned and located in these, um, uh, suitable positions as possible to enable existing and future commercial navigation to continue safely and efficiently. Um, as, uh, as Michael was referring to, shipping is, um, the greenest form of cargo, uh, transport there is presently and uh, proposed offshore renewable developments need to take into consideration the routing, uh, and operations of commercial shipping to enable that to happen.

00:40:10:21 - 00:41:01:03

The chamber has been very much engaged through the planning process with the with the applicant prior to DCO. That goes back to 2021, if not before, through scoping per the two simulator exercising tranches that have been held with the international roll on, roll off and passenger ferry services and the the hazard workshops in the development of the navigational risk assessment, um, and the NEF meetings. Uh, in aside to that, as we saw the development at the, um, prior stage, there were a range of, uh, risk scoring, um, and other hazards identified that were unacceptable on the grounds of, uh, navigational safety, both with the development of Moana in isolation, but also cumulatively with them.

00:41:01:05 - 00:41:36:08

The other 3 or 2 or potentially three um or projects within the area. The chamber, along with other navigational stakeholders at the time, advocated for enhanced mitigation measures and, uh, the constructive manner with which the developer has engaged on the red line boundary changes, um, to amend them and to take account of navigational safety, um, for both national and international services. Uh, has been, uh, very welcome. Nevertheless, there are, uh, ongoing concerns relating to deviation, relating to scheduling.

00:41:36:19 - 00:42:28:07

Uh, relating to the negative, uh, environmental impact upon the shipping industry. Uh, that still remains from the, uh, revised boundaries and from those, uh, changes. And these need, um, further, um, and full consideration. Um, where, um, what the where as a unique part of the planning process in that three projects of significant scale totalling three, 250 or so turbines and ten offshore substations

are going to or going through examination or in a sequential order at the same time that will or has the potential to take an excess of 750km<sup>2</sup> of serum away from large scale navigation in the Irish Sea.

00:42:28:09 - 00:42:58:20

The the impact of that, um, has the potential to be quite considerable. And so the chamber, um, would really appreciate understanding from the, uh, examining authority how that process for the cumulative, uh, side is going to be, uh, handled, uh, and examined and taken into consideration whilst the um, cumulative navigational risk assessment has been carried out and the chamber is undergoing, uh, a full review of that in its, um, uh.

00:43:00:08 - 00:43:21:03

full review of that documentation. The, um, sequential nature of that, um, of those applications, uh, is unique as it stands, and that is then further exacerbated or further added to by the extension of a more than in, uh, development within the Isle of Man territorial waters

00:43:23:02 - 00:43:56:20

in terms of the, uh, in terms of the membership of the Chamber of Shipping. Uh, just to be clear that, um, standalone LDN, Isle of Man Steam Packet and P&O, who were the four primary identified uh, international ferry operators, um, impacted uh, are all within membership of uh, the chamber. Uh, and we have been having engagement with them, uh, over the last, uh, previous 2 or 3 years. Uh, sea truck ferries have been purchased by, uh, CLT.

00:43:56:29 - 00:44:14:03

And that is the rationale for that change of name. Um, the chamber will offer the following on the back of this, uh, discussion here today. Seek to engage with CLG and directly to ensure that their, uh, voice can be heard and representation made to help the the process along.

00:44:16:21 - 00:44:37:13

Where we come to, um, navigational safety. Specifically, the chamber is working through its statement of common ground with the applicant. A meeting was held on the 12th of July. Uh, and we are in a process of submitting an initial statement of common ground by deadline one.

00:44:39:19 - 00:45:13:29

In relation to um, socio economic uh aspects. The chamber has repeatedly raised these at a variety of MNF and other hazard workshop areas, and primarily been informed that they are being handled within another chapter that is not within, uh, if I get a numbering correctly, either app 059 or app 098.

00:45:15:18 - 00:46:08:18

Now that is broadly correct, because those chapters deal with, uh, shipping and navigation, risk and hazard. Uh, they do not deal so, so often with operational or commercial, uh, impact. And as such, the chamber has been provided by the applicant app 077, which is the socio economic chapter. Um, to date the chamber still is on the um review of that chapter, but, uh, prima facie, the analysis of impact upon, uh, very routine and particularly the, the lifeline service for the Isle of Man, um, seems, um, relatively basic, uh, and could perhaps deal with or benefit from, uh, further detail.

00:46:09:25 - 00:46:30:13

The chamber would be happy to engage with the developer on furthering that. Um, should it be, uh, merited, but presently do not think that it may or may think that it does not cover off the full impact upon lifeline ferry services, impact of supply chains into land and so on that, uh, has been identified.

00:46:33:16 - 00:47:05:21

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Those are some really useful submissions, and hence why I've been scribbling. But, um, useful points there on that final one. Um, it's very welcomed that you're also looking at the socio economic chapter of the environmental statement. Um, my understanding is there's also an overlap into human health in terms of the way that the environmental statement deals with the effects on lifeline ferries. So I'm just up for you to discuss with the applicant, but certainly we would encourage you to look at all aspects of the interests to you and your membership when you're writing that statement of common ground.

00:47:06:18 - 00:47:37:13

Um, also welcome the fact that you're going to look to engage with CLN, um, as one of your members, um, to see whether the, um, there one way or another, their interests are represented in this process. And on your question of cumulative, obviously something we're just extremely aware of that we have uh, two other uh, in CIP offshore wind generating um, arrays now in the process slightly behind us, but really quite close. So that's more going to Morcom.

00:47:37:15 - 00:48:10:23

And also we've got an eye on the fact that there is more than an which may become an application at some point while we're in examination. So, um, we have a duty to consider, um, the environmental effects of the project alone and cumulatively. So there's absolutely a need to consider those projects. And given, um, that they are now formed projects with complete application documents, then we have a lot of information to go on. And that's why the, um, the ES in this project should consider those effects fairly fully. Um, but it's certainly something we'll be grappling with as we go through.

00:48:11:17 - 00:48:15:17

Um, I'm going to give the opportunity to the applicant to come back on any of those points.

00:48:28:15 - 00:48:47:21

Uh, Jerry Vella for the applicant. Um, nothing. Nothing specific. Um, as Mr. Merrily said, we are engaging on a statement of common ground. Full submission at deadline one and making good progress working through that. And we'll be keen to see the chamber's written representation.

00:48:49:06 - 00:48:59:14

Thank you. And I just one more question for Mr. Merediz. It's occurred to me since you were talking about ports as well. Um, do you have within your membership the Port of Liverpool or the or Douglas?

00:49:02:00 - 00:49:31:13

Mr. barrel is for chamber shipping. Uh, no, we do not. That is a separate, uh, organization, the British Ports Association, that would typically have, uh, such enterprises, uh, within their membership. There are some caveats to that. Perhaps, uh, noting, for instance, that Stena Line is also a landlord and a port

owner. Uh, but my understanding is that is for Holyhead and not for Liverpool. Um, so it's a it's a, uh, different ownership model and a different membership structure, uh, of the association.

00:49:33:06 - 00:49:45:13

Thank you. And we do note that, um, the Isle of Anglesey Council has given some submissions about Holyhead Port as well. Um, I'm Mr. Proctor. I'll just bring you in. I can see your hand raised.

00:49:46:12 - 00:49:59:19

Just to confirm that standing line is actually the, uh, the landowner for, um, pokies channel in Liverpool. So we operate both ports on either side for the services.

00:50:00:06 - 00:50:08:27

Thank you. That's very helpful. Mr. Mr. Allen, did you have a point you wanted to come on is that we passed? We passed it by. Thank you.

00:50:10:26 - 00:50:19:16

Okay, Mr. mayor, please. That completes everything we had to ask you. I'll just quickly check. There's nothing else. The applicant wants to come back on the on the chamber shipping.

00:50:19:20 - 00:50:31:02

Gerard Vella for the applicant. Um, just to note that Peel Ports, which is the the owner of Liverpool and Heysham and some other ports, were members of the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum and involved in the process as well.

00:50:31:09 - 00:51:10:19

Noted. Thank you. Okay, in that case then I'm going to suggest we move on. Thank you very much for your submissions, Mr. Mary-Louise. We're going to move on to Mr. Innes representing the, uh, one, two, three, six, uh, Orsted. When existing operational wind farms. I will just list them. Barrow. Uh Orsted. Barebow. Barebow extension, Walney morning extension and west of London Sands. Mr. Innes. Um, we've obviously read your relevant representations submitted on behalf of each of those windfarms, and we'll have you'll have seen that the applicant has provided comments on those at the procedural deadline.

00:51:10:29 - 00:51:15:14

Uh, would you like to speak on behalf of all of those windfarms together, or would you like to take them in turn?

00:51:16:13 - 00:51:17:06

Uh, colonist.

00:51:17:08 - 00:51:57:09

And Ulster IPA? So I think I think we'll just deal with them more as one. And I can be relatively brief, uh, in relation to my submissions this afternoon. Uh, insofar as the current position is concerned, um, we've raised our concerns but are currently undertaking a review of both the, uh, shipping issues and the navigational risk assessment, uh, both in relation to the project, uh, individually, Mona, and

cumulatively and clearly in the context of the interests that I represent, that cumulative picture extend into a more complex scenario.

00:51:57:17 - 00:52:29:25

Um, we will therefore be looking to make representations at deadline one, um, which highlights the main issues that arise. But obviously our consideration will then, uh, having assessed those aspects, reviewing them for the individual consents, agreements and any operational impact that may occur. But I can therefore say that we're really in the same position in relation to all the all the projects at the current time, but there may be specifics that arise from from that evaluation as we move forward.

00:52:29:27 - 00:53:29:09

But in particular, I think particularly the cumulative scenario is one which we're having to give careful consideration to. given the potential volumes that arise from that and which have been identified in the environmental statement against the background of the existing baseline. So, as I say, I don't wish to make any specifics at this point, but to flag that we will be making representations in relation to these matters and And obviously, uh, later on in the agenda, uh, it's probably premature to consider the precise mechanisms for any mitigation, but clearly that that will also be at the forefront of, uh, considerations in relation to such matters as, as has already been alluded to by the applicant in terms of their, um, uh, proposals for ongoing engagement amongst a range of parties, uh, for us, so that that really can only be worked out once we've worked out what the issues are and what our position is.

00:53:29:21 - 00:53:46:03

But that's as far as I can really go today. It was flagging that, um, this is one of the issues that we've proposed to to look at and to engage with proactively. Um, and of course, as we've done before, we also make sure that we proactively engage with the applicant in relation to the matter as well.

00:53:47:18 - 00:54:21:04

Thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. Um, we've noted in the relevant representations, particularly in relation to Burbank and the extension, that there was some reference to, um, some navigational safety matters. So about collision risk. Um, I suppose my question to you, just so we know what what to expect is, are you concerned in terms of both navigational safety, uh, because of what's the, you know, with the servicing and operations and maintenance of activities associated with those existing wind farms, or is it more of a commercial operations concern or is it both?

00:54:21:11 - 00:54:39:04

Well, it can be both. And that's the point. Until we get some comfort on the, uh, safety issue. Um, then it may well, if there were safety issues that would then lead into, uh, potential operational issues, because obviously we would have to very consider, uh, carefully evaluate any issues that arose from that.

00:54:41:14 - 00:54:45:15

Thank you very much. With the applicant, like to come back on anything? It.

00:54:48:06 - 00:54:48:21

Vella.

00:54:48:25 - 00:55:27:18

Gerard Vella for the applicant. Uh, not specifically, I think would be interested to see the relevant representation, um, once it's been submitted. I think just repeating our responses in the relevant reps, all stood. A number of members of of Orsted and their projects have been members of the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum since its inception. Um, and uh, they did attend the uh navigation um Risk Assessment Hazard workshop and were party to the conclusion that um, um potential effects had on safety of navigation and operational operation and maintenance.

00:55:27:20 - 00:55:32:18

Vessel movements had been reduced to tolerable and a lot.

00:55:36:29 - 00:55:37:26

Thank you.

00:55:40:23 - 00:56:04:10

And I will just say, Mr. Innes, I know, um, we'll come on to cover some more of the points from the Orsted, um, IPS when we talk about, uh, aviation and radar tomorrow. And I know there's been a query about whether we might also cover weak effects in the set of earrings. And the answer to that is we won't be, but it's on our radar, so to speak, for, um, future hearings or indeed written questions. But it's certainly something that's also, um, we've got an eye on.

00:56:05:18 - 00:56:06:03

Thank you.

00:56:06:18 - 00:56:38:25

Thank you. We do. We have some questions about mitigation and monitoring. But really it would be beneficial to have submissions from the MCA and Trinity House. So I think we'll cover them in writing or in subsequent hearings if we need to. Um, and indeed, maybe we'll have seen progress at, um, the next deadline that will help us anyway. Um, in which case, I think that brings us to the end of the matters that we wanted to cover under item four. Unless anybody wants to make us aware of any final points on shipping and navigation Before we move to item five.

00:56:43:18 - 00:57:08:17

Nothing. Nothing. Okay. Thank you very much. I've said it before, but we do anticipate needing some time in October when we have hearings to discuss this and then get into perhaps more of the nitty gritty once we know where we stand. Um, but for now, very much welcome. Uh, all the progress being made towards getting some statements of common ground sorted out. Um, I think what we'll do then is probably move on to item five rather than, um.

00:57:09:18 - 00:57:13:22

I think it's done for the applicant. We just need to shift people around.

00:57:13:24 - 00:57:14:14

That's fine.

00:57:14:17 - 00:57:20:21

Could we maybe just have five minutes just to do that, or we'll just shuffle around and just shuffle.

00:57:20:23 - 00:57:30:10

Just shuffle. And we'll keep going till about three, because I think otherwise we'll end up having to break twice. So, um, yes, thank you very much. And it will be Mister Rowlands who's taking over on item five.

00:58:17:01 - 00:58:49:00

Okay. Can we begin? Okay, great. So, um. Yeah, to some degree, I had questions that I would have liked to ask the Joint Nature Conservation Committee, as well as in our advisory. So when we come to these particular threats, if it's necessary, I'll ask that they are considered and taken as action points. So we might be able to go through this agenda slightly quicker than I had originally anticipated.

00:58:49:28 - 00:59:31:18

So if we start with the maximum design scenario. So for installation of pilot jacket foundation, um, this is an iOS project description, which is up dash oh 50. Um, there's a particular paragraph there. Um, which is 3.5.8.7, and it states that up to two vessels may be piling up and two other vessels drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15km between locations.

00:59:32:22 - 01:00:05:07

What we heard earlier in the hearings about them was that the minimum distance between the wind turbines, um, due to micro siting, could be 1275 rather than 1.4km. So what I want to check with the applicant is if you've got four piling operations, um, occurring concurrently, that would be, uh, within a distance of 1275.

01:00:05:09 - 01:00:07:19

Have you considered that scenario?

01:00:12:03 - 01:00:15:12

So at least done on behalf of the applicant, where does the four piles come from?

01:00:15:14 - 01:00:22:02

So if you've got two other vessels drilling simultaneously, does that mean.

01:00:23:25 - 01:00:30:18

So if you have two parts, if you have two piling vessels operating at the same time. Yes.

01:00:32:15 - 01:00:33:10

Each. Yeah.

01:00:33:19 - 01:00:48:22

Could you have two vessels operating at wind, one wind turbine, and then a further offset of 1275 and the other piling vessel there. So could you have two piling vessels operating or drilling four piles at the same time?



01:00:54:07 - 01:01:04:07

Paul Carter, on behalf of the applicant, there won't be two piling vessels on a single location on a single foundation. If there are two piling vessels concurrently, they will be at different turbine locations.

01:01:04:14 - 01:01:08:10

How many piles would be driven at the same time? Two.

01:01:08:12 - 01:01:12:14

Not for 2 to 1 for each piling vessel. Okay. Okay.

01:01:12:20 - 01:01:25:27

That's clear in terms of the phrase concurrently. Has that term been defined anywhere? What does concurrently mean? Does it mean starting and finishing at the same time, or would there be a lag?

01:01:28:29 - 01:01:33:05

McGarry on behalf of the applicant, um concurrently refers to two.

01:01:33:07 - 01:01:34:04

Vessels piling.

01:01:34:06 - 01:01:49:05

At the same time, exactly the same time. So because that's the worst case in terms of predicting the injury ranges. But in reality piling would not be exactly synchronized. But we had to make those assumptions in order to run the noise model.

01:01:49:23 - 01:01:56:16

Okay. Um, stop. Um, explanation. Uh, explicit in the documentation that we've.

01:01:56:18 - 01:02:07:15

Had, it makes, um, it provides the documentation, provides, uh, the assumptions in the noise model which describe the fact that the piling could occur at the same time.

01:02:07:26 - 01:02:16:28

Okay. So concurrently is defined somewhere in the. Yes. If you can maybe just advise where. So that is clear for us.

01:02:20:21 - 01:02:27:08

Tess McGarry and parcel applicant. Yes, we'll take that away and make sure we signpost to where it's described in the. Yes.

01:02:27:21 - 01:02:28:09

Thank you.

01:02:30:01 - 01:03:02:05

So, um, the marine mammals, which is app show 56 and paragraph 4.9.3.3 through 38. So the duration of piling there is up to 113 days. Uh, however, if you look at a different paragraph, which is what, 4.9. 3.26, the piling, um, will occur to a maximum of 114 days.

01:03:02:10 - 01:03:09:06

So if I could ask if you could just do another sense check and confirm, what is the number? Maximum date?

01:03:09:16 - 01:03:32:29

Yeah, I can take that. Tess McGarry, on behalf of the applicant. So the exact duration, uh, based on the hours of filing, was 113.5. Uh, but for the purposes of the population model, we rounded up to 114 because we take it as whole 24 hour period on which in which polling could occur. So that should explain that slight discrepancy.

01:03:33:07 - 01:03:41:11

Okay. Thank you. Maybe you could update the particular reference to 113 just so that it's captured in the documents.

01:03:45:03 - 01:04:26:08

I'd like to go on to Significance of Effects. Um, and looking at, uh, the disturbance from elevated underwater sound due to piling. Um, I would just want to understand, uh, the party's position now on acoustic deterrence devices. Um, I understand that they have not been assessed separately in the. Yes. And you've responded to that in your relevant representation, which is PDA Dash 008 and it's R-0 11.28 on this particular thread.

01:04:26:10 - 01:04:50:23

I would like an action placed on JNC and an RWA. Um, if they are satisfied with the response that you've given or whether they still think there's a need to separately assess the effects of ads. I don't know if the applicant wants to add any other thing to what I've just said.

01:04:52:00 - 01:05:15:00

Um, Tess McGarry, on behalf of the applicant. Um, well, hopefully the explanation in our response to the relevant reps should be sufficient. Um, just to reiterate, it is captured within our uh, assessment for the population modelling. So we're happy to have further engagement with JNC and NWU if required. But hopefully the response will explain everything.

01:05:15:14 - 01:05:16:17

Okay. Thank you.

01:05:18:17 - 01:05:58:26

If I can move on to disturbance to marine mammals from elevated underwater sound due to vessel use and other non piling sound producing activities. So the yes concludes that the significance effect would be minor adverse. So this is not significant in terms of EIA. Um and I do believe advisory and it's relevant. Wrap our uh dash zero 11 notes that there is inadequate justification for low magnitude due to an increase in the number of vessels in the area compared to baseline vessel traffic.

01:05:58:28 - 01:06:38:23

So I would just briefly like to explore the baseline and moon of vessels in the marine mammal study area during construction. So the baseline which is outlined in marine Mammals app dash zero 56 notes approximately 3166 vessels in total pass through the Mourne Array Array area per year. The navigational risk assessments demonstrated much of the marine mammal study area experienced over 640 vessel trips per year.

01:06:40:18 - 01:07:13:24

Then the, uh. Yes. Marine mammal Chapter notes disturbance from vessel sound is likely to occur where background ambient sound level is exceeded, and that the proposed development is located in a busy shipping area with high background sound levels. So can the applicant advise if there are any periods when vessel activity drops and that the activity background ambient sound level is not high.

01:07:32:05 - 01:07:34:26

Do you want me to maybe rephrase? Yeah. Okay.

01:07:35:03 - 01:07:36:18

Could you rephrase the question?

01:07:36:22 - 01:07:49:25

Sure, sure. So, um, it's a very busy shipping area, but, see, um, during the night, does the activity drop, which then means the background ambient level noise is not high.

01:07:51:11 - 01:07:55:03

Because on behalf of the applicant. Just for clarity, you're asking if the baseline activity drops.

01:08:01:11 - 01:08:30:01

Uh, Tess McGarry, on behalf of the applicant, I think we would need to take that one away and discuss. Um, we do not, uh, assess on the basis of very precise details of where the vessels are moving at different times of day or location. We have to take a worst case that looks at, um, when all when all vessels might be on site at the same time. But yeah, it's not something we, we look at baseline compared to the uplift in terms of where the vessels are and when they're operating.

01:08:30:24 - 01:08:55:24

I'm trying to gauge whether, if there are any marine mammal activities, even early, say, during dawn, where maybe the vessel activities is low so the ambient is not as high. And then if you're introducing more vessels during that time, what effect does that then have on the marine mammals?

01:08:56:27 - 01:09:33:23

Tessa McGarry on behalf of the applicant. Um, you know, again, I think we'll take that one away for discussion. But, you know, what I can say is that, um, the assessment is very precautionary. So the actual thresholds that we applied to the noise modeling, um, are quite low. So they in, in many cases where you have high level of shipping activity, it could actually exceed the noise threshold anyway. So there are several layers of precaution that go into the assessment. Um, the latter allow us to be very precautionary, but we will try and answer that more specifically.

01:09:34:09 - 01:10:29:29

Thank you. So, um, staying with this thread about the proposed number of vessels during construction, uh, the chapter of the Marine Mammals also recognizes that the main drivers influencing the magnitude of the impact are vessel type, speed, and ambient sound levels. So obviously we have briefly discussed the ambient sound levels with regards to speed. So the planning statement, which is up dash 186, recognises that an increase in vessel movement could lead to an increase in interactions between marine mammals and vessels, and then goes on to say, and vessels travelling at 14 knots or faster are those most likely to cause death or serious injury to marine mammals.

01:10:30:20 - 01:11:01:02

It is expected that vessels involved in the construction phase of the Moana Offshore Wind project would But travel slower. So referencing to the traveling slower statements, which is less than 40 knots, which has been used as a form of reasoning. It's unclear how this reasoning is implemented in the application and has been secured anywhere in the DCO.

01:11:01:04 - 01:11:05:03

So can the applicant elaborate on this point?

01:11:11:29 - 01:11:34:19

Tessa McGarry on behalf of the applicant. Um, so the measures to minimise disturbance from vessel and minimise the risk of collision with marine mammals will be secured via the offshore MP. Um, and uh, that also, uh, describes the code of conduct for vessels that would minimise disturbance to marine mammals and to rafting birds as well.

01:11:35:08 - 01:11:43:27

Um, with regards to the specific points of 14 knots, because it's obviously been, uh, stated in the documentation.

01:12:00:09 - 01:12:22:01

The list done. On behalf of the applicant, I suggest we try and follow that thread through. Um, I suspect if it was included in the planning statement, it's in the chapter somewhere and has been taken from there and taken through. But I think we just need to to follow that thread through. Okay. Sorry. Hannah Adams for the applicant. Um, I've just opened Document App to.

01:12:22:03 - 01:12:54:06

Zero five, which is a document that, um, Tesla was just referring to. And if I direct you to paragraph 1.2, .1.3, that makes reference to the wildlife safe scheme, the Ys scheme. And there are several um, measures within that to um, minimise the risk of collision with, with marine mammals. Um, so that includes things like avoiding sudden changes in speed, avoiding over revving of engines, codes of conduct, that sort of thing. So those measures are outlined within that document.

01:12:54:18 - 01:13:09:15

Okay. So it gives a like an overview. But as I'm being specific about a particular speed threshold I'll let you take away and then, um, consider a response to it. Is that okay? Yeah.

01:13:11:03 - 01:13:35:01

Um, can I also place an action on JNK? And now w um, I still like to know if they can confirm that position. Uh, regarding magnitude for disturbance to marine mammals. For far from elevated underwater sound due to vessel leaves and other non piling sound producing activities.

01:13:39:12 - 01:13:39:29

Okay.

01:13:44:25 - 01:14:11:23

I have some questions here, but I think I'll address these in written questions. Um. um, to, uh, relevant parties. If we can go on to the, uh, the, the outline offshore construction method statements and Outline offshore environmental Management plan have been referenced within the. Sorry.

01:14:14:06 - 01:14:16:06

Have you got something to say? I'm just.

01:14:18:05 - 01:14:43:21

No, no, I'm. I'm. If I can just finish. Is that okay? Yeah. The the outline offshore construction method statements and outline offshore environmental management plan have been referenced within the yes and within the DML conditions contained in the Draft Development Consent Order Schedule 14. However, these documents have not been provided

01:14:45:18 - 01:14:53:06

and the examining authority would like to understand why. So yeah, sorry. This is your opportunity to give an explanation.

01:14:57:21 - 01:15:16:13

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, it was never intended that they would be provided in outline. So they're not missing from. It's if they are referenced. Uh, if the DCO development consent order does reference them as being an outline, we just need to strike that out. They weren't they weren't ever intended to be submitted as outline documents.

01:15:16:17 - 01:15:23:05

Good. Yeah. Can I check with you, though? They are relied upon to mitigate the facts.

01:15:33:18 - 01:15:53:26

If I can maybe just elaborate slightly as well. So the marine licence, uh, principle documents. Yeah. Uh, identifies information that would be contained in the offshore construction method statement. So that implies that you're relying on mitigation measures but you're not providing the documents to give confidence.

01:15:53:28 - 01:16:28:06

Less done on behalf of the applicant. I suspect if I look at it now, the reason the Marine Licence Principles document refers to things that are in the outline construction method statement is because they are matters that are listed in the draft, the marine license as needing to be included in the

construction method statement when that is approved by Natural Resources Wales through the marine licence. So if I can find the relevant, uh, section, um, there is I, uh, there we are.

01:16:28:08 - 01:17:05:15

So, um, so, uh, marine licence condition 18 one e refers to the offshore environmental management plan, and it lists out what needs to be in there. So it says a marine pollution contingency plan, chemical risk assessment, waste management plan, fisheries liaison officer, etc., etc.. What the Marine Licence Principles document has done is to say when there is a environmental management plan, uh, um, that will be needed for the transmission, uh marine license.

01:17:05:17 - 01:17:48:29

It will also cover those things, as I said yesterday, to provide that bridge, to make sure that the marine license and the standalone marine license cover the same points. So where they're listed in the Marine License Principles document, it is because we have taken the detail from the deemed marine license and said all of these things will be covered in that standalone marine license, and this is where we anticipate they're going to be. And the reason we've done it like that is because, as I said yesterday, there is difference in terminology between the drafting of the marine license and how we anticipate, if it's granted that NSW will turn things for the purposes of the standalone marine license.

01:17:50:04 - 01:17:51:06

Does that make sense?

01:17:51:19 - 01:18:17:25

Yes, but I have a feeling that there might be further questions on this. Uh, later. Uh, uh, during the examination on that particular thread of, uh, the Diem marine license condition 18 one e that you mentioned. Uh, obviously it's it's there the offshore environmental management plan for the period of construction and operation.

01:18:19:10 - 01:18:27:25

Can you clarify if it would be in place also for the pre commencement activities, which could involve UXO?

01:18:30:20 - 01:19:05:29

Less done on behalf of the applicant. There are separate controls around UXO clearance within the draft. Uh uh. Sorry. The draft D marine license within the development consent order. So if you look at condition 21, um, uh, it, um, and I think there is another, uh, condition. Sorry, I haven't got it right in front of me at the moment. But effectively, in terms of pre commencement activities for offshore matters within the de marine licence.

01:19:06:03 - 01:19:24:24

Um, it is very clear that there is a procedure for agreeing um, uh, UXO survey if that's done as a pre commencement activity and any unexploded ordnance. Sorry. I mean any unexploded ordnance clearance would be done in accordance with condition 21.

01:19:28:07 - 01:19:30:08

Details that need to be agreed under that.

01:19:30:10 - 01:19:42:29

So in the context of the offshore environmental management plan, can I just be clear on this that you're not looking to have that in place for pre commencement activities.

01:19:50:14 - 01:20:00:12

It's not on behalf of the applicant. No that is not intended to be in place for pre commencement activities. Just so unlike unlike the approach that has been taken in the onshore stage.

01:20:00:14 - 01:20:01:08

Yeah. Okay.

01:20:02:24 - 01:20:21:21

Um, can you summarize for me the difference between the outlined offshore environmental management plan and the project environmental management plan. Are they similar or what does one do and the other does by the separate.

01:20:24:28 - 01:20:29:21

Sorry list done on behalf of the applicant. Where's the project environmental management plan reference?

01:20:29:23 - 01:20:37:17

I think it's referenced in offshore in principle monitoring plan. Uh, which is app 2 or 1.

01:20:39:02 - 01:21:02:23

Is done on behalf of the applicant. I suspect that should refer to the Offshore Environmental Management plan. I suggest we review those and make sure that the terms are consistent. It is certainly not intended that in the offshore environment, there would be more than one environmental management plan, okay, for the generation element, although there will be one separate one potentially for transmission.

01:21:02:25 - 01:21:18:20

Okay. The time difference as well as yeah are not the same. So one is four months and the other one is something like six weeks prior to commencement for the pump, which is the project environmental management plan.

01:21:20:14 - 01:21:28:27

So the pump isn't a formal mitigation, additional mitigation. It's it's just maybe a little something that.

01:21:33:00 - 01:21:44:14

Was done on behalf of the applicant. We're getting slightly confused. Um, I suspect it's probably best if we take this away and check the documents and the references. Um, and we'll provide updates as needed.

01:21:44:19 - 01:22:07:19

Okay, okay. Um, I have only one further question. Um, and then. yeah, we'll look maybe to break after this. Um, but can the applicant summarize why there is no provisions for marine mammal monitoring to test the predictions made within the impact assessments?

01:22:18:27 - 01:22:34:14

Uh, Tess McGarry, on behalf of the applicant, um, we have concluded for our impact assessment for marine mammals that there is no, uh, significant effects for the the project alone for piling. Okay, so, um, we haven't committed to monitoring at this stage.

01:22:34:21 - 01:23:09:11

Okay. Thank you for that explanation. And if we can have an action point for JNC and and W advisory, um, where the, um, the uh, uh, concur with the, uh, the applicant's position on this. I'm conscious that we have an I w, uh, licensing on the on virtually, and I just wanted to check if they wanted to use this opportunity to highlight any measures or matters that is of concern.

01:23:09:13 - 01:23:14:14

I recognize that it might be difficult, but I just want to give you the opportunity.

01:23:17:26 - 01:23:32:09

Thank you, Pete Morrison. And I don't mean licensing. Um, no, I don't have any matters to raise at this moment. I again thought it was useful, as I mentioned yesterday, raising the pre commencement discussion. And that's something we'll we'll look at ourselves as well.

01:23:34:17 - 01:23:41:08

Thank you. Can I check to see if any party wishes to raise any other particular points.

01:23:45:23 - 01:23:59:13

No I'm not seeing. So we'll bring this particular agenda item to a close. And then if I can check with Mrs. Jones, shall we have a breakout?

01:23:59:22 - 01:24:02:06

Yeah, I would be more sensitive. Okay.

01:24:02:08 - 01:24:02:24

Last agenda.

01:24:02:28 - 01:24:09:08

So, um, shall we recommence? Uh, uh, 3:10. Thank you.