

RE: SZC Submission - EA Sch5 [N6] Requests 3&5

From: NNB Generation Company (SZC) Ltd

Sent: Mon 29/11/2021 11:24

Below are the filename definitions for the GIS shp files that have been provided to Environment Agency in relation to tasks 3 and 5 in Schedule 5 (no. 6).

I hope this is all clear but let me know if anything further is required.

Foraging range statistic

M = Mean (km)

MM = Mean maximum (km)

MMSD = Mean maximum + SD (km)

Bird species name

LBBG = Lesser black-backed gull

CT = Common Tern

ST = Sandwich Tern

LT = Little Tern

Colony name

Orfordness = Orfordness colony

Minsmere = Minsmere colony

Dingle = Dingle Colony

Slaughden = Slaughden Colony

AldeOre = Alde-Ore Estuary SPA & Ramsar

OTMinsmere = Outer Thames Estuary SPA (Minsmere)

OTOrfordness = Outer Thames Estuary SPA (Orfordness)

Foraging range

x_xkm

Tool used

Clip

Project

SZB =SZB Alone

SZB = SZC Alone

Comf12 = SZB and SZC together

Plume effluent/chemical

Thermal_2c = Thermal uplift at 2oC at sea surface

Thermal_3c = Thermal uplift at 3oC at sea surface

Bromoform = Bromoform

TRO = Total Residual Oxidants

Hydrazine = Hydrazine

HydrazineChronic = chronic level hydrazine

OEP = Organic Enrichment Plumes

From: Senior Permitting Officer: Nuclear New Build
National Permitting Service (Part of National Operations)

Sent: 25 November 2021 16:04

Thanks for your response on Tuesday (23/11/2021) regarding Schedule 5 No,6 (information requests 3 and 5).

Following a review by my colleagues, we have identified two issues with the GIS files provided. To address Schedule 5 notice No.6 and allow us to progress with our HRA related tasks, please provide responses to the two requests specified below:

Request 1.) Please provide shapefiles of the new foraging areas used in the response to Schedule 5 No.6.

Background to request 1

Following review of the information submitted on the 23/11/2021, you have provided us with appears to be the intersection of the foraging ranges and the plumes.

Although we have not been able to check all of the submitted GIS files directly, the naming convention (as discussed in more detail via point 2 below) suggests this is the case for all the files provided.

Request 2.) Please provide notes to help explain exactly how the file naming convention works for the submitted GIS files.

Background to request 2

We have been provided with 467 shapefiles, with data split into two folders:

- 'Closest Coastal Point Shapefiles – Nov' (222 files)
- 'Foraging Overlap Shapefiles – Nov' (245 files).

There are no accompanying notes, but the file names appear to follow a convention, that we have interpreted as a concatenation of:

- The foraging range statistic &
- the colony name &
- the bird species name &
- the foraging range for this (statistic + colony + species combination) &
- the term '_clip_' &
- the plume effluent &
- the plume chemical

However, for some files it is unclear what the file name means. For example where the plume effluent is given as '_Comf12', and where the plume chemical is given as '_OEP'.

If you have any queries regarding the above please do not hesitate to contact me.