

Marine Development Lancaster House Hampshire Court Newcastle Upon Tyne NE4 7YH T +44 (0) 300 123 1032 F +44 (0) 191 376 2681 www.gov.uk/mmo

Peter Robottom National Infrastructure Directorate The Planning Inspectorate (via e-mail only)

Your ref: TR030002 Our reference: DCO/2014/00002

07 September 2015

Dear Mr Robottom,

PROPOSED YORK POTASH HARBOUR FACILITIES RESPONSE TO EXAMINING AUTHORITY'S WRITTEN QUESTIONS (ExQ – Deadline 2)

The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is an interested party for the examination of Development Consent Order (DCO) applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) in the marine area. The MMO received the Examining Authority's written questions on 27 July 2015.

The MMO's responses to the relevant written questions are presented within Appendix 1 attached to this letter.

Please note that the MMO reserves the right to make further comments on this application throughout the examination process and to modify its present advice or opinion in view of any additional information that may come to our attention.

Further to MMO confirming attendance to the DCO hearing on 25 September, I can now confirm attendees as follows Adam Chumbley, Jayne Griffiths and Joe Wilson.



Adam Chumbley
Marine management Organisation

CC: Jayne Griffiths – MMO Joe Wilson – MMO Morag Thomson – Eversheds Matt Simpson – Royal Haskoning



Appendix 1 MMO Response to the Examining Authority's written questions

(2)	Question to	Question MMO	Response
Panel			
Ref.			
HWF 1.6	Applicant Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	Sediment plume modelling data The marine sediment and water quality assessment uses the sediment plume modelling simulations to inform the assessment of impacts on marine water quality. The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) in their relevant representation has requested that the applicant submits information relating to the validation and calibration of the sediment regime models. The applicant is requested to provide this information for Deadline 1. The MMO are requested to review this information and provide their comments for Deadline 2. The MMO's response should identify any concerns they may have regarding the information and an explanation of the potential effect of these concerns on the sediment plume modelling simulations and assessment of impacts on the marine water quality	The MMO is content with the response from the applicant and has no further comments on the sediment plume modelling data. MMO are content that the worst case rate of sediment release used is appropriate to determine an assessment of the impacts.



⊔\ \/⊏	Applicant	Effect of spill of polybolite product on the	The MMO are content with the response by the applicant. The MMO does not
HWF 1.7	Applicant Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	Effect of spill of polyhalite product on the marine environment Paragraph 7.6.12 of the ES (Doc 6.4) states that in the event of a spill "the components of the polyhalite product pose no significant threat to the marine environment." However, no evidence has been provided by the applicant to justify this statement. The applicant is requested to provide justification for this statement for Deadline 1. The MMO is requested at Deadline 2 to comment on the applicant's response to this question and state whether in the MMO's opinion the components of the polyhalite product pose no significant threat to the	The MMO are content with the response by the applicant. The MMO does not legislate against the cargo on vessels, if an incident did occur the MMO would coordinate a pollution response as per MMO process if required. Although MMO does not have concerns surrounding the polyhalite material.
HWF 1.8	Applicant Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	Securing dredging mitigation through the DML The ES confirms that an enclosed grab dredging method would be used for the contaminated sediment above geological deposits (ES paragraphs 7.5.4. and 7.5.12, Doc 6.4). The Governance Tracker (Doc 6.8) confirms that the use of this method is secured through the MMO licence in Schedule 4 of the DML (Doc 4.1) (see Part 6(3)). However, it is not clear if this reference should be to the draft DML in Schedule 5 of the draft DCO. Please can the applicant at Deadline 1 clarify whether the reference to Schedule 4 in the Governance Tracker should be to Schedule 5 (DML) and whether	MMO are content with the applicant's response. The dredging plant for the contaminated material must be secured by the use of an enclosed grab as a condition in the DML.

		Hill O(O) I al DNII I al	
		condition 6(3) in the DML is the relevant	
		condition to secure the use of enclosed grab	
		dredging method to remove contaminated	
		sediment? Paragraph 7.5.20 of the ES (Doc	
		6.4) confirms that where an enclosed grab	
		cannot be used, the use of a backhoe	
		dredger would be the least environmentally	
		damaging in comparison to the other options	
		assessed. Part 6 of the MMO licence does	
		not commit to the use of a backhoe dredger	
		for the remainder of the dredging (Doc 4.1).	
		Please can the applicant comment on	
		whether given this statement, is would be	
		appropriate to commit to the use of the	
		backhoe dredging in the DML where an	
		enclosed grab cannot be used? If so, please	
		can the applicant provide appropriate	
		wording to secure this commitment through	
		the DML.	
		Please can the MMO at Deadline 2 comment	
		on the applicant's response to this question	
		and confirm whether the MMO is satisfied	
		that the mechanism identified for securing	
		this mitigation is appropriate? If not, please	
		can the MMO identify what mechanism	
		would be appropriate?	
WFD	Applicant	Data used to inform the WFD Compliance	The MMO are content with the applicant's response and have no further
1.1	Marine	Assessment The applicant has provided a	comments.
	Management	WFD	
	Organisation	Compliance Assessment as part of their	
	(MMO)	DCO application in Appendix 4.3 of the	
	,	Environmental Statement. The sources of	
		baseline data used to inform the assessment	
		are outlined in paragraphs 1.2.8-9 of the	
		WFD Compliance Assessment. This includes	
	I	1 1010000	1

		the hydraulic modelling results established to	
		understand the effects of the development	
		on the physical processes in the Tees	
		Estuary.	
		Within their relevant representation the	
		Marine Management Organisation (MMO)	
		requested the submission of validation and	
		calibration data for the modelling software	
		used. Please can the Applicant provide this	
		information for Deadline 1?	
		Please can the MMO comment on this	
		information for Deadline 2? The MMO is	
		asked to identify in their response any issues	
		arising out of this information which may	
		affect the modelling results and to explain	
		whether these would have any implications	
		on the applicant's WFD Compliance	
		Assessment	
WFD	Applicant	Detailed compliance assessment	The MMO has reviewed the table added to the Governance Tracker. The MMO
1.5	Marine	In relation to each waterbody screened into	are content that the wording in the DCO and DML are appropriate for the securing
	Management	the WFD Compliance Assessment, a number	of the mitigation measures.
	Organisation	of mitigation measures are proposed to	The MMO has discussed and is consistent with the EA on this matter.
	(MMO)	ensure any potential impacts of the proposed	
	The	development would not cause deterioration	
	Environment	in the status of the waterbody (e.g.	
	Agency	paragraph 4.1.8).	
		However, the WFD Compliance	
		Assessment does not indicate how each of	
		these measures would be secured in the	
		DCO/DML. The Applicant is asked to provide	
		for Deadline 1 a Table identifying how each	
		mitigation measure proposed in the WFD	
		Compliance Assessment would be secured	
		and delivered through the	
		requirements/conditions in the DCO/DML.	

Please can the MMO and EA comment for	
Deadline 2, on whether the wording of the	
requirements/conditions identified in the	
DCO/DML to secure and deliver the	
mitigation measures proposed in the WFD	
Compliance Assessment is sufficient? If not,	
please identify wording that would you	
consider appropriate to secure and deliver	
the mitigation measures proposed.	