F om
To
Cc
Subject
Date 01 Novembe 2021 12 03 17
A tachments image001.png

Mo ning ,

Please f nd in the table below the SZC esponses fo the emain ng EA Info mat on Requests.

Info mat on Request	EA Request	SZC Response
1	**For consideration of the mpact of waste stream A as part of the determination of the SZC WDAs permit appl cat on, please prov de explanation why the 3°C thermal exceedance period for sme t changed from 7% to 4.6% with n TR302.**	As noted by the EA Rev. and Rev.5 of TR302 reco ds the percentage of m gration per od that the 25% thermal occlusions threshold is exceeded or sme t as .6%. In the prev ous vers on (Rev.3) of TR302 records the same value s quoted as 7%. The difference in the two figures elates o the m gration period; .6% includes February to Apr l inclusive, 7% includes February to March only (exclusive of Apri). As deta led in the Executive summary amendments to the the mal barr ers to f sh migrat on section (.2.3) were made fol owing meetings with the EA in December 2015. Addit onally within the DCO submiss on, the EA have raised questions regarding Smelt and thermal avoidance thresholds. BEEMS SPP101 (submit ed as part of responses to Schedule 5 request No.2) has further information on Smelt and reafli ms the February through Apr l per od (inclusive).
2	**Please confirm if the copy of TR302 suppl ed with the SZC operational WDAs perm t applicat on** (as efe ence [85] with n Append x E) **s edit on 3 revision 5, or edition 3 revision 6.**	Due to the time since the first release (201) the document numbe ing between the EDF and BEEMs sys ems is out of sync. The eport shou d forma ly be refe red to fo lowing the EDF numbering on page 1. The report is Edi ion 3, Revision 5.
6a	We need to discuss the potential fo the two cooling wate (CW) and two fish ecove y and etu n (FRR) outfa ls to nc ease tu bid ty at SZC as pa t of ou WDA pe mit s HRA. The efo e, **please can you confirm f there are any additional diagrams and/or d mens on deta ls for the proposed SZC operat onal CW and FRR outfall structures ava lable for reference?**	There is no further informat on ava lable at p esent. The main cooling water outfal s w ll be the same as at HPC, there ore the EA has all the known schemat cs on this. There s no further design information on the FRR outfall at th s ime. What can be noted at this time is that it will inevi ably be similar to the design at HPC, but may be on a sma ler sca e accounting or the smaller diameter of the tunnel (as per be ow).
6b	In esponse to info mation equest 2(e) of the SZC WDA Schedule 5 No 2 notice, a copy of the following Hinkley Point C (HPC) epo t was p ovided - HPC Cooling Wate Inf ast uctu e F sh P otect on Measu es Repo t to Discha ge DCO equi ement CW1 and Ma ne L cence Condition 5.2.31, Ma ch 2016. This epo t has been efe enced in SZC WDA space fo ce ta n aspects we e inf ast uctu e f om HPC is intended to be adapted/ epl cated at SZC. **Please can you confirm if any of the deta ls regarding the CW and/or FRR outfall designs/dimensions referenced w thin the HPC CW1 report are appl cable to the SZC operational CW and FRR outfalls?** If so, please confi m in w it ng which details. The potent ally elevant sections f om CW1 we have identif ed to date a e efe enced below	**Section 9: Cool ng water outfall pages 75 to 84)** • *9.1 (General descr ption) As for HPC* • *9.2 (Location of outfa) Same princ ple but further offshore. HPC outfa l is ca 2km o fshore whereas SZC wi l be ca 3km* • *9.3 (Outfall tunnel) Same principle but larger diameter. HPC nternal diameter is 7m whereas SZC wi l be 8m. The larger diameter is required to offset headloss caused by the longer tunnel.* • *9.4 (Outfall sha ts) Intention is as for HPC but tbc* • *9.5 (Outfall head structures) Intention is as for HPC but tbc* • *Figure 38 (3D view of the CW outfall structure) Intention is as for HPC but bc* • *Figure 39 (section through CW outfall structure) Intention is as for HPC but tbc* • *Figure 40 (plan view of CW outfall structure) Intention is as for HPC but bc* • *Table 13 (dimensions of the CW outfall head structures: overa l length = 9.26m, width at back = 6 58m, height = 3.2m and width at front = 10.45m) Intention is as for HPC but tbc* **HPC FRR utfall structure de ails** • *8.1.34 to 8.1.39 and figure 34 (Fish return system (HCF) ou fa l struc ure, pages 73 and 74) Design w ll replicate HPC where possible but FRR tunnel has smaller diameter. Design tbc* • *16.1.4 i to xii (Re urn to sea (HCF) - Comp iance w th EA Criteria, page 135) In general yes, though the system has marked (beneficial) di ferences as each HCB bu ld ng wi l discharge direct to sea. Gutter diameters and rad i may vary slightly but w ll rema n compliant with EA (2010). Instead of a single outfall at 0.9m internal diameter (x) SZC will have 2 separate unnels of ca 0 65m diameter. (xi) wi l not apply either directly either due to d fferent starting locations of the FRR tunnels but w ll rema n compliant with EA (2010).* • *Section 17: 17.1.1 to 17.1.13 (Outfall head - Compliance with EA Criteria, pages 139 and 140) **To note – Section 17 provides deta ls for the m in ng w t r utf ll not the FRR. There is no separate description or assessment of the FRR ou fall head.** Section 17: although some design features di fer (e.g. location offshore) the SZC cool ng water ou fa l remains compliant with all elements of EA (2010) apart from the lack of bars across the outfall (see 17.1.4(vii)). As explained at 17.1.5-17.1.13 bars are not possible and do not a fect the impact assessment.*

It is ou unde standing these eponses close out all the act ve EA IRS fo the WDA. Please let us know whethe you believe this assessment is inco ect, o if you have any quest ons on the above.

Best,

(Pronouns: He / Him)
Environmental Engineer
Sizewe l C Pro ect
90 Whitfield St eet, London, W1T 4EZ
MS Teams Numbe