Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Connah's Quay Low Carbon Power Project
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 4 (ISH4) - Part 2
Date:	18 March 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

Created by event.video

1
00:00:04.380 --> 00:00:06.340
Okay, thank you. Uh, welcome back.

2
00:00:06.420 --> 00:00:09.280
Uh, re- recommence the meeting. Uh, hearing, sorry.

3
00:00:09.320 --> 00:00:13.280
Gosh, get my head right. Um, I'm now going to move on to item

4
00:00:13.320 --> 00:00:16.300
four on the agenda, which is the item specifically related to climate

5
00:00:16.360 --> 00:00:20.000
change. And we're now going to move to the applicant to provide an update on their

6
00:00:20.010 --> 00:00:23.720
assessment shortly of the potential for the proposed development to contribute

7
00:00:23.760 --> 00:00:26.820
towards and mitigate for the effects of climate change.

8
00:00:26.860 --> 00:00:30.500
I'll then come to the other interested parties online and in the room.

9
00:00:30.540 --> 00:00:33.780
Before I do that, I'll try and remember and ask the applicant to introduce their

10
00:00:33.840 --> 00:00:37.820
experts this time, if that's okay, please.

11
00:00:41.420 --> 00:00:44.320
James Straughan for the applicant.

12
00:00:44.380 --> 00:00:48.360
And, sir, to my right, Mr. Roger Bramwood

13
00:00:48.800 --> 00:00:52.740
from Uniper, and to his right, Mr. Ben Murray

14
00:00:53.820 --> 00:00:54.740
from AECOM.

15
00:00:56.380 --> 00:00:57.300
Thank you.

16
00:00:59.220 --> 00:01:02.220
I'm conscious I have Dr. Boswell online already identified.

17
00:01:02.240 --> 00:01:05.280
Is there any other party that I have missed who would like to speak on the subject

18
00:01:05.300 --> 00:01:08.580
of climate change before we commence this session?

19
00:01:10.220 --> 00:01:12.130
Okay, thank you.

20
00:01:12.280 --> 00:01:16.190
Um...

21
00:01:20.460 --> 00:01:24.080
So item four point one, what I was looking here is

22
00:01:24.140 --> 00:01:26.370
the... I'll split it into two parts if you like.

23
00:01:26.400 --> 00:01:29.520
The contribution that the proposed development potentially could have

24
00:01:29.580 --> 00:01:33.290
towards, the effects of climate change, including upstream and

25
00:01:33.380 --> 00:01:36.240
downstream emissions that result from its operation.

26
00:01:36.280 --> 00:01:38.220
Principally, its operation is what I'm concerned about rather than its

27
00:01:38.260 --> 00:01:41.200
construction. I think you've gone into a lot of detail there to explain

28
00:01:41.520 --> 00:01:44.600
that. And then we'll move on later to how potentially

29
00:01:44.700 --> 00:01:47.370
the development might benefit climate change.

30
00:01:48.800 --> 00:01:52.450
So following, the latest

31
00:01:52.500 --> 00:01:55.160
submissions that I've received and published on the Planning Inspectorate website

32
00:01:55.200 --> 00:01:58.580
in the examination library, please could you, the applicant, advise initially on

33
00:01:58.620 --> 00:02:02.260
your latest position with regards to the potential climate change

34
00:02:02.340 --> 00:02:05.440
effects from the operation of the, proposed

35
00:02:05.520 --> 00:02:09.259
development?

36
00:02:09.400 --> 00:02:09.961
Ben Murray

37
00:02:11.960 --> 00:02:14.380
for the applicant. Yes, sir. Uh,

38

00:02:15.540 --> 00:02:19.269
as you say, the overall, carbon emissions

39
00:02:19.380 --> 00:02:21.880
are dominated by the operational phase.

40
00:02:21.989 --> 00:02:25.920
And our assessment, as laid out in chapter twenty of

41
00:02:25.960 --> 00:02:29.900
the environmental statement, that phase accounts for forty-two

42
00:02:29.980 --> 00:02:33.740
million, six hundred thousand tons of carbon dioxide

43
00:02:33.860 --> 00:02:37.600
over its operating life or, or, rather carbon dioxide

44
00:02:37.680 --> 00:02:39.940
equivalent, I should, I should note.

45
00:02:40.020 --> 00:02:40.160
Um,

46
00:02:41.920 --> 00:02:45.820
the, the construction phase and the decommissioning

47
00:02:45.880 --> 00:02:49.750
phase, we have estimated for the construction phase specifically,
around four

48
00:02:49.800 --> 00:02:52.140
hundred and seventy thousand tons.

49
00:02:52.210 --> 00:02:56.180
Uh, that's based on the embodied emissions for the earth materials,

50
00:02:56.540 --> 00:02:59.100
and the transport to site, plus construction

51
00:02:59.160 --> 00:03:03.100

activities. In the decommissioning phase, it's more uncertain given that

52
00:03:03.120 --> 00:03:07.040
that is going to happen many years into the future, post a date when the

53
00:03:07.100 --> 00:03:10.980
UK is expected to have achieved its net zero targets.

54
00:03:11.020 --> 00:03:14.560
In the absence of any detailed, information

55
00:03:14.620 --> 00:03:18.590
around decommission activities, we've taken a, a, a worst case view and

56
00:03:18.620 --> 00:03:22.020
have applied the same emissions as in the construction

57
00:03:22.080 --> 00:03:24.780
phase. That is a, a very much a worst case

58
00:03:25.040 --> 00:03:29.020
scenario. In the operational phase, overwhelmingly,

59
00:03:29.060 --> 00:03:32.800
the emissions do come from the upstream supply of natural

60
00:03:32.920 --> 00:03:35.800
gas. Um, it is the case that

61
00:03:36.020 --> 00:03:39.740
in, projects of this nature where we have

62
00:03:39.800 --> 00:03:42.020
carbon capture attached to the flue

63
00:03:42.080 --> 00:03:46.020
gases, yeah,

64

00:03:46.120 --> 00:03:49.970
the upstream emissions do become the predominant source of emissions.

65
00:03:50.020 --> 00:03:53.660
This is because it is a low carbon energy

66
00:03:53.780 --> 00:03:57.060
source relative to an unabated gasified power station.

67
00:03:57.070 --> 00:04:00.760
An existing unabated gasified power station would have around

68
00:04:00.800 --> 00:04:03.980
sixteen percent of its emissions happening in that upstream

69
00:04:04.020 --> 00:04:07.140
phase. If you apply best available

70
00:04:07.260 --> 00:04:09.960
te-te-technique of, of carbon capture, that

71
00:04:10.100 --> 00:04:13.960
upstream, share of the overall

72
00:04:14.060 --> 00:04:17.101
operational emissions becomes around two-thirds of the total.

73
00:04:17.140 --> 00:04:20.760
So yes, it does predominate. Uh, in

74
00:04:20.800 --> 00:04:23.900
addition to that, we also have additional emissions from

75
00:04:24.840 --> 00:04:25.380
what we call

76
00:04:26.360 --> 00:04:30.300
a TNS unavailability in the event that the transport

77
00:04:30.360 --> 00:04:33.800

and storage network, the downstream part of the system,

78
00:04:34.940 --> 00:04:38.160
is unavailable in an unplanned manner.

79
00:04:38.200 --> 00:04:41.500
We have to, to, factor that in, and we've taken a

80
00:04:41.560 --> 00:04:45.260
conservative view that the downstream TNS network will

81
00:04:45.300 --> 00:04:48.060
operate with an availability of ninety-five percent.

82
00:04:48.100 --> 00:04:52.060
So we add on an additional five percent of

83
00:04:52.120 --> 00:04:55.640
the emissions that would be captured.

84
00:04:55.720 --> 00:04:58.980
Again, we think that is a very cautious basis.

85
00:04:59.080 --> 00:05:02.880
Uh, unavailability in the TNS, network falls into

86
00:05:03.320 --> 00:05:06.760
planned outages and unplanned outages.

87
00:05:06.860 --> 00:05:09.930
Um, in the event of a planned outage, that would be,

88
00:05:11.340 --> 00:05:15.100
scheduled to coincide with maintenance at the plant and the

89
00:05:15.200 --> 00:05:17.760
other emitters, so we don't think that's gonna have

90
00:05:18.940 --> 00:05:22.740
any impact on emissions. However, unplanned outages, as the name

91
00:05:22.760 --> 00:05:26.460
su-suggests, can happen any time because of a

92
00:05:26.500 --> 00:05:26.860
failure.

93
00:05:27.740 --> 00:05:31.600
Um, so that's where that additional emissions come from, and that falls into the

94
00:05:31.660 --> 00:05:35.620
downstream category. Yeah. In your question you talk about

95
00:05:35.760 --> 00:05:38.660
the, the upstream and, downstream effects,

96
00:05:40.080 --> 00:05:43.920
possibly with thought to the Finch case in the,

97
00:05:44.070 --> 00:05:47.540
Supreme Court. Yes, we have taken a whole life

98
00:05:47.740 --> 00:05:51.200
view and a whole value chain view of the

99
00:05:51.240 --> 00:05:53.140
operations of this,

100
00:05:53.960 --> 00:05:57.940
installation. As we've said, the upstream phase is dominated

101
00:05:58.080 --> 00:06:01.640
by emissions that happen in the natural gas su-supply

102
00:06:01.700 --> 00:06:03.500
chain. You've got direct emissions on

103
00:06:03.600 --> 00:06:07.340
site-That is the unabated

104

00:06:07.560 --> 00:06:10.220
share of the combustion emissions that isn't captured

105
00:06:11.280 --> 00:06:14.660
by the capture plant. And then you've got the impact of

106
00:06:15.280 --> 00:06:18.860
that TNS, the unavailability in the downstream phase.

107
00:06:18.900 --> 00:06:22.660
So yes, we feel that we have captured the entire, value

108
00:06:22.720 --> 00:06:25.260
chain as well as the whole life over the various

109
00:06:25.280 --> 00:06:27.280
phases.

110
00:06:28.220 --> 00:06:32.120
Thank you. Sorry, can you just reiterate to me again the downstream

111
00:06:32.420 --> 00:06:34.940
component and how you have assessed that?

112
00:06:35.000 --> 00:06:37.320
I, I appreciate I've had a look at your document, but I'm just trying to make sure

113
00:06:37.360 --> 00:06:37.560
that-

114
00:06:37.570 --> 00:06:37.570
Yeah.

115
00:06:37.570 --> 00:06:39.080
-I haven't missed something what you just said there.

116
00:06:39.120 --> 00:06:41.460
So appreciate your upstream, the, um

117
00:06:42.700 --> 00:06:45.600

sorry. Bear with me. Um, upstream

118
00:06:47.500 --> 00:06:51.220
abstraction of the gas, delivery of the gas to site, any losses and leakages there.

119
00:06:51.280 --> 00:06:55.140
Right at your site, your abated plant on your-- in your proposal for how you've

120
00:06:55.160 --> 00:06:58.130
dealt with it being potentially unabated due to outages and what have you.

121
00:06:58.680 --> 00:07:02.200
What about how you've assessed the downstream component of

122
00:07:02.260 --> 00:07:06.100
how, I take that electricity and use it in an inefficient way

123
00:07:06.140 --> 00:07:06.280
to

124
00:07:07.500 --> 00:07:08.710
put on a patio heater or something like that?

125
00:07:08.710 --> 00:07:11.100
Okay. So the user emissions in th-

126
00:07:11.119 --> 00:07:11.280
Yeah.

127
00:07:11.290 --> 00:07:14.710
-in this case, the, the end use of the electricity is dealt

128
00:07:14.740 --> 00:07:18.480
with already within our a-assessment because the emissions from

129
00:07:18.540 --> 00:07:21.760
that are captured by the combustion of the fuel.

130

00:07:21.800 --> 00:07:22.160
Okay.

131
00:07:22.220 --> 00:07:25.820
So if, yeah, if you are an end user in a household or a

132
00:07:25.840 --> 00:07:29.280
factory, you would factor in, in

133
00:07:29.340 --> 00:07:31.700
your,

134
00:07:34.240 --> 00:07:37.220
reporting, you would factor in how much power you

135
00:07:37.260 --> 00:07:39.160
are importing from the grid. Um,

136
00:07:40.320 --> 00:07:43.640
now the power station is already

137
00:07:44.320 --> 00:07:48.080
reporting those same emissions for, for emissions that, that go up its stack.

138
00:07:48.140 --> 00:07:51.810
This is why when we talk about carbon accounting, we break emissions down into

139
00:07:51.920 --> 00:07:54.960
scopes. We have scope one, scope two, and scope

140
00:07:55.080 --> 00:07:58.750
three. Um, and these are viewed from the

141
00:07:58.800 --> 00:08:02.600
perspective on-- of an emitter. So if you are the

142
00:08:02.640 --> 00:08:06.600
power station, i.e. the applicant in this case, your scope

143

00:08:06.720 --> 00:08:10.260
one emissions, that-- those are the ones over which you have got direct

144
00:08:10.300 --> 00:08:13.480
control, and these are the ones that go up your stack.

145
00:08:13.540 --> 00:08:14.580
Yes.

146
00:08:14.640 --> 00:08:17.480
Your scope, three emissions

147
00:08:18.380 --> 00:08:22.240
would include things that happen in the upstream, natural

148
00:08:22.300 --> 00:08:26.200
gas sup-- supply chain, and also that result from

149
00:08:26.400 --> 00:08:29.140
unavailability of the downstream transport and storage

150
00:08:29.180 --> 00:08:33.160
network. Okay. Because these are things that they might

151
00:08:33.220 --> 00:08:36.920
end up happening at your site, but they are the result of a

152
00:08:37.020 --> 00:08:39.461
failure of the downstream network.

153
00:08:41.220 --> 00:08:43.140
Now, if you are the user of the

154
00:08:43.220 --> 00:08:46.740
electricity, in, in order to

155
00:08:46.820 --> 00:08:50.380
avoid double counting, say you're a factory that consumes a lot of

156
00:08:50.420 --> 00:08:51.100

electricity,

157
00:08:52.320 --> 00:08:54.940
the emissions from electricity are put un-under your scope

158
00:08:55.020 --> 00:08:57.800
two. And scope

159
00:08:57.860 --> 00:09:01.420
two, covers emissions from the consumption of

160
00:09:01.620 --> 00:09:05.200
imported electricity or possibly heating or cooling or other imported

161
00:09:05.260 --> 00:09:07.900
services. And again, scope three is

162
00:09:08.740 --> 00:09:12.500
things elsewhere in the value chain over which you do not have direct

163
00:09:12.540 --> 00:09:14.000
control or influence.

164
00:09:14.060 --> 00:09:14.590
Okay.

165
00:09:15.420 --> 00:09:16.950
Thank you. Very helpful. Um,

166
00:09:28.220 --> 00:09:32.000
I'm going to probably move, to other parties in the room first, but I just want

167
00:09:32.080 --> 00:09:32.450
to,

168
00:09:34.320 --> 00:09:37.660
clarify that thank you for the clarity that you've given me there.

169

00:09:37.680 --> 00:09:41.080
And the, and the bit that I'd like to concentrate, as we just said, is

170
00:09:41.360 --> 00:09:44.740
operational upstream emissions at the moment.

171
00:09:44.800 --> 00:09:48.370
Um, I appreciate what you've told me about the availability of the transport and

172
00:09:48.440 --> 00:09:51.080
storage network and the approach that you've taken there

173
00:09:51.160 --> 00:09:52.560
to,

174
00:09:54.220 --> 00:09:57.080
look at potential outages in that supply chain.

175
00:09:57.120 --> 00:10:00.680
And also, I think we talked, quite a lot in the previous

176
00:10:00.800 --> 00:10:01.740
hearings about

177
00:10:04.060 --> 00:10:07.980
potential downage time at-- and outage times at the site for maintenance and,

178
00:10:08.000 --> 00:10:10.860
and commissioning, when potentially the, the, the TNS,

179
00:10:11.980 --> 00:10:14.960
supply chain might not be even available at that time. So thank you.

180
00:10:14.980 --> 00:10:18.080
I think we've covered all that off, and I understand all that, hopefully.

181
00:10:18.140 --> 00:10:21.860
Um, so I just want to really focus in on the upstream emission

components of

182
00:10:21.920 --> 00:10:25.530
this. Uh, I'm probably gonna come to,

183
00:10:25.759 --> 00:10:28.760
Dr. Boswell next, if that's okay, for some of the points he's raised.

184
00:10:28.780 --> 00:10:32.640
But before I do that, firstly, thank you for the submissions that,

185
00:10:32.680 --> 00:10:34.780
that all parties have made to this examination.

186
00:10:34.800 --> 00:10:38.560
It's been very informative, read, helpful to me .

187
00:10:38.620 --> 00:10:41.980
I apologize, particularly, to the applicant and also to Dr.

188
00:10:42.000 --> 00:10:45.520
Boswell that you've all said that you'd like to request to present some information

189
00:10:45.580 --> 00:10:49.340
visually at these hearings. Um, I'd rather they were submitted as evidence to the

190
00:10:49.350 --> 00:10:52.880
examination library for all to see, because different people, as I've already

191
00:10:52.900 --> 00:10:55.880
explained earlier, in different viewing platforms and different access arrangements

192
00:10:56.060 --> 00:10:57.760
might not be able to view what you're presenting.

193
00:10:57.800 --> 00:11:01.279
So my-- for fairness of all, I would prefer you to submit that, and

we'll

194
00:11:01.360 --> 00:11:05.060
include that on the examination library, even if it's an e-extract of something

195
00:11:05.080 --> 00:11:07.880
that you've already produced, if you'd like to draw attention to that.

196
00:11:07.900 --> 00:11:11.620
But I wanted to be consistent because we have turned down other parties, and I

197
00:11:11.640 --> 00:11:12.440
want to make sure that we

198
00:11:13.340 --> 00:11:14.070
are fair to everybody.

199
00:11:15.220 --> 00:11:18.380
Um, so please feel free to submit any information like that you might want to

200
00:11:18.400 --> 00:11:20.000
showcase to me at your next deadline.

201
00:11:20.580 --> 00:11:24.280
Um, before I go to you, Dr.

202
00:11:24.300 --> 00:11:27.280
Boswell, assuming you wish to speak on this topic.

203
00:11:27.300 --> 00:11:29.980
Principally, from what I've gathered from the evidence that you've submitted to me

204
00:11:30.000 --> 00:11:32.680
and all the information that, I've read, is

205
00:11:33.920 --> 00:11:37.140
there are three activities that you have raised some concern about

relating to the

206
00:11:37.160 --> 00:11:40.620
emissions upstream that could potentially contribute to climate change and you

207
00:11:40.660 --> 00:11:43.490
believe may have been us-underestimated.

208
00:11:43.500 --> 00:11:47.130
And these are the upstream emissions, and my

209
00:11:47.140 --> 00:11:49.700
understanding is that the climate emergency sites law have challenged the

210
00:11:49.740 --> 00:11:53.600
presumption that future national, natural, I can't

211
00:11:53.680 --> 00:11:57.000
say the word, natural gas provision will be predominantly

212
00:11:57.500 --> 00:12:01.300
by pipeline from Norway, but could also be by,

213
00:12:01.500 --> 00:12:05.472
liquefied na-natural gas supply from other sources around the world.My

214
00:12:05.492 --> 00:12:08.322
second, understanding is-- or maybe we should take these one at a time.

215
00:12:08.332 --> 00:12:11.072
But, but I-- probably let's do one at a time 'cause that'd be easier, I think, for

216
00:12:11.132 --> 00:12:14.732
going through the, the topic. I also understand you wanna discuss the

217
00:12:14.752 --> 00:12:18.412

potential for, underestimation of methane

218
00:12:18.472 --> 00:12:22.452
leakage in the short term, and then finally, the efficiency of

219
00:12:22.472 --> 00:12:23.972
the actual carbon capture itself.

220
00:12:23.982 --> 00:12:27.322
So, like I say, those are the three things I've picked out from the evidence,

221
00:12:27.692 --> 00:12:30.222
you've supplied to me. So feel free to, uh...

222
00:12:30.232 --> 00:12:33.512
Would you like to now e-elaborate on any of those points or provide any more

223
00:12:33.572 --> 00:12:35.972
detail over and above what I've just said?

224
00:12:36.012 --> 00:12:39.172
So sl-let's take the first point, upstream emissions and where you

225
00:12:39.212 --> 00:12:42.812
believe, the liquified natural gas may, arrive

226
00:12:42.852 --> 00:12:43.812
from.

227
00:12:45.192 --> 00:12:47.752
Uh, good, good, good morning, sir. Yes. Um, Dr.

228
00:12:47.772 --> 00:12:51.182
Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency Science and

229
00:12:51.292 --> 00:12:55.032
Law. Um, yeah, just to clarify

230
00:12:55.332 --> 00:12:58.892

first of all that the,

231
00:13:00.612 --> 00:13:04.272
the first two of the points you've just mentioned, the

232
00:13:04.292 --> 00:13:08.012
upstream methane emissions and the WTT,

233
00:13:08.872 --> 00:13:12.692
the well to tank factor, and the methane

234
00:13:12.792 --> 00:13:16.552
climate metric or short-term methane impacts,

235
00:13:16.592 --> 00:13:20.352
those are upstream effects. But of course, the assumed

236
00:13:20.432 --> 00:13:23.652
CO2 capture rate is a scope

237
00:13:23.752 --> 00:13:26.992
one issue, a-and not

238
00:13:27.052 --> 00:13:29.712
upstream. So just to sort of make that distinction.

239
00:13:29.732 --> 00:13:32.312
But I think for the moment you want to home in

240
00:13:33.172 --> 00:13:37.032
on the upstream methane emissions and the

241
00:13:37.212 --> 00:13:39.932
WTT factor, um-

242
00:13:39.942 --> 00:13:42.592
Uh, well, like, like I said, the-- what, what I gathered from reading the evidence

243
00:13:42.612 --> 00:13:45.272
you've submitted to me, sorry to interrupt you there, but is I, I

think there are

244
00:13:45.332 --> 00:13:48.902
three things that you have highlighted to me that are potential either concerns or

245
00:13:48.952 --> 00:13:52.532
underestimating-- underestimations that you believe the client, the applicant

246
00:13:52.712 --> 00:13:56.692
may have made. And, the first one of those

247
00:13:56.732 --> 00:14:00.572
was that the assumption about where the natural gas will come

248
00:14:00.612 --> 00:14:03.072
from and the carbon emissions relating to that.

249
00:14:03.092 --> 00:14:06.972
The second one around potential for shorter scale methane leakages,

250
00:14:06.992 --> 00:14:08.192
which we'll come to as a separate item.

251
00:14:08.232 --> 00:14:10.512
We've-- I think it would help me if I can understand it in those three.

252
00:14:10.552 --> 00:14:12.592
If there's something I've missed, this is where I, I think it'd be useful to say-

253
00:14:12.632 --> 00:14:12.642
Mm-hmm

254
00:14:12.642 --> 00:14:16.112
... 'No, there's another thing as well.' And then finally, the efficiency of the

255
00:14:16.152 --> 00:14:17.692
carbon capture process itself.

256
00:14:17.702 --> 00:14:17.702
Mm-hmm.

257
00:14:17.752 --> 00:14:19.632
So let, let-- if we could start with

258
00:14:20.832 --> 00:14:24.012
what very simply my point of view is where, where does the na-
natural gas come from

259
00:14:24.052 --> 00:14:27.812
in the future may have different upstream carbon

260
00:14:27.892 --> 00:14:31.372
dioxide emissions, and how you think that might relate.

261
00:14:31.382 --> 00:14:33.552
Would, would, would that be okay? Or is there another item that you
think I may

262
00:14:33.592 --> 00:14:35.272
have missed?

263
00:14:35.372 --> 00:14:39.162
Um, yeah. Uh, yeah, Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency

264
00:14:39.312 --> 00:14:42.352
Science and Law. N-no, those are the three main

265
00:14:42.412 --> 00:14:46.272
factors, sir. Uh, I was just sort of clarifying their,

266
00:14:46.292 --> 00:14:49.152
their different scopes, at that point.

267
00:14:49.192 --> 00:14:49.442
Oh, thank you.

268
00:14:49.512 --> 00:14:52.752
Um, so homing in on, on your question,

269
00:14:53.332 --> 00:14:54.152
on the,

270
00:14:55.412 --> 00:14:59.252
the upstream, emission factors, so the

271
00:14:59.292 --> 00:15:03.222
upstream, methane emissions and the-- how the emission factors

272
00:15:03.252 --> 00:15:07.152
are calculated. Um, the upstream emissions

273
00:15:07.232 --> 00:15:09.392
depend upon the supply

274
00:15:10.272 --> 00:15:14.212
source and the supply chain,

275
00:15:14.312 --> 00:15:17.852
and the emission intensities of both CO2 and

276
00:15:17.932 --> 00:15:21.512
methane. There's both CO2 and methane in the upstream

277
00:15:21.552 --> 00:15:24.812
emissions from different points in the supply chain.

278
00:15:24.832 --> 00:15:26.972
The, the emission intensities

279
00:15:27.832 --> 00:15:31.072
of the supply source and along the supply chain.

280
00:15:31.112 --> 00:15:34.632
So those are basically the sort of physical things we are

281
00:15:34.712 --> 00:15:36.212
looking at here.

282

00:15:37.212 --> 00:15:37.552
Um,

283
00:15:38.632 --> 00:15:42.552
where you were drilling in was really on the supply chain

284
00:15:42.572 --> 00:15:46.352
and the source of the gas t-into the UK natural

285
00:15:46.432 --> 00:15:48.172
gas supply.

286
00:15:48.192 --> 00:15:48.202
Mm-hmm.

287
00:15:48.312 --> 00:15:51.932
And w-what I, have

288
00:15:52.012 --> 00:15:55.932
done in my latest submission, Rep

289
00:15:56.032 --> 00:15:58.732
3085,

290
00:15:59.632 --> 00:16:01.972
is that I provided

291
00:16:03.252 --> 00:16:06.882
e-an evidence base based on the latest information from

292
00:16:07.452 --> 00:16:10.712
go-government, central government bodies like NESO,

293
00:16:11.892 --> 00:16:12.582
and,

294
00:16:13.932 --> 00:16:17.172
Natural Gas. Not, not a government body obviously, but, like, you

295
00:16:17.241 --> 00:16:20.992
know, the company operating in the

296
00:16:21.132 --> 00:16:24.792
area. Um, which all the evidence

297
00:16:24.852 --> 00:16:27.812
is pointing to,

298
00:16:29.392 --> 00:16:33.382
more reliance on imported gas in the future.

299
00:16:33.452 --> 00:16:37.412
And within that, larger proportions

300
00:16:37.472 --> 00:16:41.032
of LNG coming through the system.

301
00:16:41.092 --> 00:16:44.872
Now, so I don't sort of waste time, with stuff

302
00:16:44.932 --> 00:16:48.792
you, you know, we've, we've got in that rep, so I can delve into that or I can

303
00:16:48.832 --> 00:16:51.792
just sort of say that's where I'm pointing to-

304
00:16:51.802 --> 00:16:51.822
I, I-

305
00:16:51.822 --> 00:16:53.772
... depending as you wish, sir.

306
00:16:53.812 --> 00:16:55.772
I, I... If I could just stop you. I, I, I-- thank you.

307
00:16:55.792 --> 00:16:59.072
I've read, read that evidence and interestingly seen other supporting evidence-

308
00:16:59.412 --> 00:16:59.442
Mm-hmm

309
00:16:59.442 --> 00:17:02.392
... not least on the news today. But, you know, there is this-

310
00:17:02.412 --> 00:17:02.472
Mm-hmm

311
00:17:02.482 --> 00:17:06.192
... uncertainty about where future gas supply will come

312
00:17:06.252 --> 00:17:06.532
from.

313
00:17:06.542 --> 00:17:06.542
Mm.

314
00:17:06.552 --> 00:17:08.232
And I completely get-

315
00:17:08.312 --> 00:17:08.322
Mm

316
00:17:08.322 --> 00:17:08.532
... that

317
00:17:09.972 --> 00:17:13.252
where... L-let's take the fact...

318
00:17:13.272 --> 00:17:16.032
Well, now, okay, let me try and understand it if I can. Tell me if I'm wrong.

319
00:17:16.252 --> 00:17:19.873
How that gas is extracted, processed and delivered

320
00:17:20.613 --> 00:17:24.333
has the potential for different carbon dioxide and

321
00:17:24.373 --> 00:17:28.262
methane emissions, whether it comes from a pipe from Norway or

322
00:17:28.272 --> 00:17:31.692
whether it comes on a big tanker from Qatar, for instance.

323
00:17:31.712 --> 00:17:33.742
So I un-I understand what you're saying, I think.

324
00:17:33.912 --> 00:17:33.922
Mm.

325
00:17:33.932 --> 00:17:35.742
Well, I-- that's why I hope I think I understand.

326
00:17:36.192 --> 00:17:40.072
That depending on how the gas arrives, it has a different level

327
00:17:40.132 --> 00:17:43.152
of CO... Well, let's just call it carbon dioxide and methane outputs for the

328
00:17:43.212 --> 00:17:45.692
minute. And therefore-

329
00:17:45.712 --> 00:17:45.731
Mm

330
00:17:45.752 --> 00:17:48.712
... there is the potential for underestimation

331
00:17:48.832 --> 00:17:52.632
of, how much upstream

332
00:17:52.692 --> 00:17:55.572
CO2 has been emitted by the delivery of that product.

333
00:17:55.612 --> 00:17:57.832
What, what I'm interested in is,

334
00:17:59.432 --> 00:18:01.792
and this is crystal ball gazing and I think I asked Mr.

335

00:18:01.832 --> 00:18:04.902
Brownwood, sorry, a, a similar question in the future about how, how do you think

336
00:18:04.952 --> 00:18:06.082
the electricity is gonna work in the future?

337
00:18:06.092 --> 00:18:10.040
But similarly-I don't think anyone can probably put their finger on how the

338
00:18:10.060 --> 00:18:13.000
gas will arrive in the future, 'cause that will depend on circumstances and

339
00:18:13.120 --> 00:18:14.460
markets.

340
00:18:14.480 --> 00:18:15.220
Mm-hmm.

341
00:18:15.260 --> 00:18:18.880
But what I'm interested in, I think, is how is this

342
00:18:19.060 --> 00:18:22.980
different for Connors Quay than any other gas consumer in the

343
00:18:23.040 --> 00:18:26.760
country? I, I acknowledge that they all have different emission rates,

344
00:18:27.380 --> 00:18:31.050
but will-- I guess what, I'm probably answering my own sort of question in a way,

345
00:18:31.080 --> 00:18:34.640
is i-i-- any other gas-fired power station will be having that same level of

346
00:18:34.680 --> 00:18:37.960
upstream emission or any other gas consumer.

347

00:18:37.980 --> 00:18:41.160
I guess where you would draw the comparison is if you drew it to a

348
00:18:41.180 --> 00:18:44.880
different power production source, like solar or nuclear for

349
00:18:44.960 --> 00:18:47.430
instance. You'd say, "Your

350
00:18:48.400 --> 00:18:51.940
emissions, upstream emissions for your particular power plant has

351
00:18:52.100 --> 00:18:56.080
gone up compared to that baseline

352
00:18:56.120 --> 00:18:59.780
level." But I'm, I'm saying if, if there are a number of gas consumption

353
00:19:00.480 --> 00:19:04.100
processes in the country, they're all gonna be impacted by that upstream change

354
00:19:04.900 --> 00:19:08.320
similarly, I would think. Could you help me

355
00:19:08.880 --> 00:19:10.740
understand if I've got that right?

356
00:19:11.400 --> 00:19:15.190
Ye-yes, sir. Dr. Andrew Roswell, cl-climate change

357
00:19:15.240 --> 00:19:18.380
science and law. Um, yes, I think that is

358
00:19:18.460 --> 00:19:22.440
correct. The gas supply for Connors Quay, as I

359
00:19:22.460 --> 00:19:25.780
understand it, would come from the National Transmission

360

00:19:26.000 --> 00:19:29.740
system. I think it is NTS. Um, and,

361
00:19:30.000 --> 00:19:32.420
as you say, it would for other,

362
00:19:33.780 --> 00:19:37.440
gas-fired power stations, abated or unabated, and

363
00:19:38.080 --> 00:19:41.840
it does for, con-cons- domestic

364
00:19:41.900 --> 00:19:45.210
industry and con, and domestic

365
00:19:45.280 --> 00:19:48.760
consumers a-as well. So that i-- that, that, that, that's

366
00:19:48.780 --> 00:19:52.360
completely correct. Um, what we have

367
00:19:52.400 --> 00:19:55.560
in, i-in this situation in trying

368
00:19:55.780 --> 00:19:59.540
to, assess the uncertainty of the greenhouse

369
00:19:59.620 --> 00:20:02.700
gas emissions is we have to

370
00:20:04.680 --> 00:20:08.080
l-take a diff, understand the difference between being able to

371
00:20:08.120 --> 00:20:11.900
track molecules. So, you know, can we

372
00:20:11.920 --> 00:20:15.480
track a molecule from Texas all the way to Connors Quay?

373
00:20:15.540 --> 00:20:19.460
The answer is no, we can't. But, you know, the difference between

374
00:20:19.560 --> 00:20:22.880
tracking molecules and how the market works.

375
00:20:22.940 --> 00:20:26.760
And in my, my seven pages, on

376
00:20:26.840 --> 00:20:30.440
this, on, on the gas supply, th-that's sort of

377
00:20:30.500 --> 00:20:33.690
pages seven to fourteen I think of my,

378
00:20:34.340 --> 00:20:35.900
submission,

379
00:20:37.240 --> 00:20:41.089
I, I, I do put quite a lot about... in about how the market

380
00:20:41.160 --> 00:20:44.880
will work, and particularly how the market will work when a

381
00:20:45.860 --> 00:20:49.620
abated gas-fired power station or dispatchable gas-fired

382
00:20:49.700 --> 00:20:53.500
power station like Connors Quay, actually comes

383
00:20:53.560 --> 00:20:56.880
into the merit order and actually starts to generate

384
00:20:56.960 --> 00:21:00.880
electricity. That's in a stressed situation,

385
00:21:01.480 --> 00:21:03.720
and in that situation,

386
00:21:05.180 --> 00:21:08.880
all the evidence we gain from the documents I, I've presented

387

00:21:09.500 --> 00:21:11.220
point towards

388
00:21:12.060 --> 00:21:16.040
a r- a high reliance on imports to handle the s- the

389
00:21:16.100 --> 00:21:20.040
sit- the situation where the, you know, the, the, the, the national gas

390
00:21:20.120 --> 00:21:23.700
supply, needs to run extra

391
00:21:23.800 --> 00:21:27.360
facilities like a Connors Quay working in dispatch mode.

392
00:21:28.100 --> 00:21:30.140
Um, and,

393
00:21:32.280 --> 00:21:35.700
also of that, as I say, you know, a high proportion of

394
00:21:35.800 --> 00:21:38.440
LNG. So we're not trying to track

395
00:21:38.520 --> 00:21:41.700
molecules, but we're trying to assess the

396
00:21:41.760 --> 00:21:45.300
uncertainty and how that, then that uncertainty

397
00:21:45.340 --> 00:21:48.480
applies to the environmental impact assessment.

398
00:21:48.490 --> 00:21:51.700
I hope that's sort of clarified things.

399
00:21:51.740 --> 00:21:53.900
Yeah. Yes, it has. Thank you. Thank you, and appreciate we're gonna come onto the

400

00:21:53.940 --> 00:21:54.800
other, other sections you've got.

401
00:21:54.820 --> 00:21:58.340
But that's, that is useful, and I think I do...

402
00:21:58.400 --> 00:22:00.780
I have got my head around. Well, thank you again for all the information you've

403
00:22:00.860 --> 00:22:04.640
sent. But also, having read it and tried to summarize it in my head, I think

404
00:22:04.700 --> 00:22:05.230
that is all

405
00:22:06.160 --> 00:22:09.940
ticking off, and I completely get what you're saying about at the time when

406
00:22:10.120 --> 00:22:13.740
a dispatchable power is required, there could be burdens on the

407
00:22:13.840 --> 00:22:17.320
network which mean we're having a higher reliance on other supply chains.

408
00:22:17.420 --> 00:22:17.690
Um,

409
00:22:19.400 --> 00:22:21.840
thank you. I'm gonna come back to the applicant for a right to reply if that's

410
00:22:21.980 --> 00:22:22.480
okay.

411
00:22:22.500 --> 00:22:22.680
Mm-hmm.

412
00:22:22.700 --> 00:22:25.640

But again, what, what I'm trying to get my head around, and I think you've, you've

413
00:22:25.660 --> 00:22:26.900
answered it a bit there with, you know,

414
00:22:27.860 --> 00:22:31.700
Connors Quay will be an abated dispatchable power system that will

415
00:22:31.760 --> 00:22:34.760
sort of be used when these, these peaks and troughs are

416
00:22:34.780 --> 00:22:38.660
required, is

417
00:22:38.880 --> 00:22:40.200
how is it different

418
00:22:42.040 --> 00:22:42.300
to

419
00:22:43.220 --> 00:22:44.980
any other gas

420
00:22:46.080 --> 00:22:46.900
consumer

421
00:22:48.100 --> 00:22:51.780
in, in the UK, and how is it different to any other

422
00:22:52.840 --> 00:22:54.540
non-gas consumer

423
00:22:56.380 --> 00:22:59.480
that produces dispatchable power?

424
00:22:59.560 --> 00:22:59.820
So

425
00:23:00.660 --> 00:23:02.150
I'm sorry, that's a bit of a weird question.

426
00:23:02.160 --> 00:23:06.120
But what I'm trying to get my head around is surely if carbon's emissions go up for

427
00:23:06.140 --> 00:23:09.980
Connors Quay 'cause they're buying liquid natural gas from Qatar, Texas,

428
00:23:10.020 --> 00:23:10.860
wherever it comes from,

429
00:23:11.740 --> 00:23:14.500
so it will for every other comparable

430
00:23:15.680 --> 00:23:19.520
development. And how much will it go up

431
00:23:19.600 --> 00:23:21.480
compared to someone who doesn't

432
00:23:23.520 --> 00:23:25.660
process liquid natural gas

433
00:23:26.740 --> 00:23:30.120
to produce their power? Is that a fair question?

434
00:23:30.140 --> 00:23:32.060
Do you mind?

435
00:23:33.240 --> 00:23:33.980
Penrhyn Marie

436
00:23:36.320 --> 00:23:40.040
for the applicant. Uh, yes, sir. I know there are quite a number of things to

437
00:23:40.100 --> 00:23:43.520
unpack here. Yes, and, and I think first of all, your point

438
00:23:43.720 --> 00:23:47.120

about none of us having crystal b***s I think is, is, is well made.

439
00:23:47.200 --> 00:23:50.840
Um, there is clearly uncertainty around any prediction

440
00:23:50.920 --> 00:23:53.720
of future trends, and I think that that is, has to be

441
00:23:53.760 --> 00:23:55.770
noted. The,

442
00:23:56.600 --> 00:24:00.500
a supply of natural gas into the UK comes from various sources.

443
00:24:00.540 --> 00:24:03.440
We have our own production in the North Sea.

444
00:24:03.480 --> 00:24:06.020
We import substantial amounts from Norway.

445
00:24:06.040 --> 00:24:09.970
There are two major pipelines that come directly from Norway into the UK,

446
00:24:10.140 --> 00:24:13.040
one at St. Fergus and one I think in

447
00:24:13.100 --> 00:24:17.076
Yorkshire. Plus, there isA

448
00:24:17.086 --> 00:24:20.996
share of the existing UK natural gas market that comes in

449
00:24:21.216 --> 00:24:24.436
by ship in the form of LNG from exactly that,

450
00:24:24.556 --> 00:24:27.536
Texas, Qatar, Algeria, wherever it may come

451
00:24:27.556 --> 00:24:31.356
from. These various sources

452
00:24:32.795 --> 00:24:36.476
have to be sort of aggregated in order to produce an

453
00:24:36.536 --> 00:24:39.416
overall well-to-tank emissions factor.

454
00:24:41.396 --> 00:24:42.836
We know that

455
00:24:43.836 --> 00:24:47.756
UK domestic production has got higher emissions than

456
00:24:47.996 --> 00:24:51.816
Norwegian production. The, the North Sea

457
00:24:53.576 --> 00:24:54.016
Transition

458
00:24:54.936 --> 00:24:58.206
Authority, the NSTA, has produced a very useful,

459
00:24:58.426 --> 00:25:02.376
infographic that shows quite clearly that Norwegian gas has got
lower

460
00:25:02.516 --> 00:25:05.396
upstream emissions than UK gas.

461
00:25:05.436 --> 00:25:09.046
Conversely, LNG imports have got a,

462
00:25:09.636 --> 00:25:13.116
m- a substantially higher upstream emissions because of the

463
00:25:13.176 --> 00:25:17.096
additional work that has to be done to liquefy and transport

464
00:25:17.156 --> 00:25:19.176
and then regasify that gas to put it into the

465
00:25:19.256 --> 00:25:23.096
network. The well-to-tank factor that the

466
00:25:23.136 --> 00:25:26.416
government, publishes annually as part of its annual

467
00:25:26.536 --> 00:25:30.176
dataset, and it is the standard factor that has been

468
00:25:30.196 --> 00:25:34.096
used for this assessment, has got to try and, as I said,

469
00:25:34.196 --> 00:25:37.336
aggregate all these various sources and come up with an overall

470
00:25:37.536 --> 00:25:41.056
representative figure, and that's quite challenging.

471
00:25:41.156 --> 00:25:44.636
If you look at the methodology paper that is published that

472
00:25:44.996 --> 00:25:48.936
basically explains here's how we worked out these numbers, it

473
00:25:48.976 --> 00:25:52.716
provides a reference to a technical paper that was produced

474
00:25:52.796 --> 00:25:56.616
for the European Commission, and that is looking at,

475
00:25:57.356 --> 00:26:00.776
at natural gas that explicitly takes account of

476
00:26:00.856 --> 00:26:04.596
venting, flaring, and what we call, fugitive emissions of

477
00:26:04.636 --> 00:26:07.676
methane. That is all factored into that.

478
00:26:07.736 --> 00:26:11.416

There have been occasions in the recent past where

479
00:26:11.476 --> 00:26:15.136
the well-to-tank factor for, for natural gas has taken a

480
00:26:15.296 --> 00:26:18.596
fairly hefty jump upwards from one year to the next.

481
00:26:18.656 --> 00:26:22.276
As well as the methodology paper, there is a here's what's

482
00:26:22.316 --> 00:26:25.296
different this year from last year paper every year.

483
00:26:25.376 --> 00:26:29.336
And on that occasion, I think that happened in twenty-twenty-one, it said

484
00:26:29.576 --> 00:26:33.396
there has been a rise in LNG imports, and this has resulted in a

485
00:26:33.536 --> 00:26:36.166
thirty-two percent increase in the well-to-tank factor

486
00:26:37.636 --> 00:26:41.216
of this year. Those factors are published two years in arrears,

487
00:26:41.276 --> 00:26:44.486
so what happens in twenty nineteen gets reflected in the twenty

488
00:26:44.576 --> 00:26:47.696
twenty-one emissions factor and so on.

489
00:26:47.776 --> 00:26:51.176
So that's a bit of background onto, you know, how the gas gets here.

490
00:26:51.196 --> 00:26:54.716
Looking into the future, there are various

491
00:26:54.756 --> 00:26:58.536
projections and scen-scenarios about what the share of different

492
00:26:58.576 --> 00:27:01.696
sources of gas into the UK might be.

493
00:27:01.796 --> 00:27:01.946
Um,

494
00:27:02.816 --> 00:27:05.096
they don't all align with each other.

495
00:27:05.156 --> 00:27:09.116
The NESO Future Energy scen-scenario is quite a useful

496
00:27:09.136 --> 00:27:12.256
source. They talk about Norwegian gas. They talk about LNG.

497
00:27:12.276 --> 00:27:15.976
There's, there's also a sector called generic imports that's a
little bit less

498
00:27:16.056 --> 00:27:19.216
useful that could include LNG as well as other forms of

499
00:27:19.256 --> 00:27:23.056
gas. For most of the scenarios

500
00:27:23.116 --> 00:27:27.016
explicitly, the explicit LNG sector is, remains

501
00:27:27.076 --> 00:27:30.236
lower than the explicit Norwegian sector for most

502
00:27:30.296 --> 00:27:31.176
years.

503
00:27:32.496 --> 00:27:36.396
Added to that, we know that there are a number of

504
00:27:36.516 --> 00:27:37.836
national and international

505
00:27:38.956 --> 00:27:42.756
plans and projects and initiatives specifically aimed at tackling emissions of

506
00:27:42.796 --> 00:27:46.576
methane because everybody accepts that it is a powerful greenhouse

507
00:27:46.616 --> 00:27:50.556
gas. You know, not only is it more powerful than

508
00:27:50.596 --> 00:27:54.466
CO2 over a hundred-year lifetime, it is even more powerful over

509
00:27:54.556 --> 00:27:57.276
a shorter lifetime. It is a... It's what we call a short-lived

510
00:27:58.176 --> 00:28:01.736
greenhouse gas. It stays in the atmosphere for around about, twelve years or

511
00:28:01.796 --> 00:28:03.196
so.

512
00:28:04.076 --> 00:28:07.716
And because of this, the various emissions sources of methane across the

513
00:28:07.756 --> 00:28:11.436
economy in agriculture, in, in construction, in the oil and gas

514
00:28:11.476 --> 00:28:14.936
sector, there are a whole range of, of initiatives

515
00:28:15.356 --> 00:28:19.116
specifically aimed at reducing that, and we hope that they will, will

516
00:28:19.156 --> 00:28:22.676
be successful. All of us want to see less methane in the

517
00:28:22.696 --> 00:28:25.396

atmosphere. Coming onto the point about

518
00:28:26.536 --> 00:28:30.116
how the gas is used by which c-consumers, absolutely

519
00:28:30.156 --> 00:28:33.936
correct, as, as you alluded to. If you've

520
00:28:33.996 --> 00:28:37.656
got a, a power station with, carbon capture and

521
00:28:37.716 --> 00:28:41.696
storage, and then next door to it you've got an unabated power station, they are

522
00:28:41.756 --> 00:28:45.496
both using the same gas. So all of the factors that influence the

523
00:28:45.556 --> 00:28:49.456
upstream supply of natural gas will apply equally to either

524
00:28:49.496 --> 00:28:53.026
consumer. Now, not only is the proposed

525
00:28:53.136 --> 00:28:53.656
development

526
00:28:54.496 --> 00:28:54.836
got

527
00:28:55.916 --> 00:28:59.316
a carbon capture plant that is gonna extract the bulk of the

528
00:28:59.456 --> 00:29:02.056
direct scope one emissions and put them under the sea.

529
00:29:03.056 --> 00:29:04.746
Because of that, it will be,

530
00:29:05.896 --> 00:29:08.976
dispatched earlier in what we call the merit order.

531
00:29:09.676 --> 00:29:09.996
Okay.

532
00:29:10.516 --> 00:29:14.176
Okay? So when NESO as the

533
00:29:14.336 --> 00:29:18.136
system operator is trying to decide which generating units to connect

534
00:29:18.216 --> 00:29:21.036
to the nat- a national grid in order to meet

535
00:29:21.056 --> 00:29:24.236
demand, they apply what's called a merit

536
00:29:24.296 --> 00:29:28.236
order, and that is influenced by,

537
00:29:28.496 --> 00:29:31.796
well, actually by the marginal cost of these things.

538
00:29:31.816 --> 00:29:35.716
But if you've got a power station with carbon capture storage and a

539
00:29:35.736 --> 00:29:38.576
power station without carbon capture storage, they will always take the carbon

540
00:29:38.616 --> 00:29:42.456
capture storage one first. And on that basis, I think that we

541
00:29:42.516 --> 00:29:45.756
can state quite definitively that this power

542
00:29:45.816 --> 00:29:49.156
station in a certain scenario where

543
00:29:49.696 --> 00:29:53.336
dispatchable power is required, this will displace unabated

544
00:29:53.416 --> 00:29:54.016
gas.

545
00:29:55.016 --> 00:29:58.756
And as we've said, all of the factors, all of the uncertainties that

546
00:29:58.816 --> 00:30:00.696
influence the upstream natural gas supply

547
00:30:01.636 --> 00:30:05.196
will affect abated or unabated equally.

548
00:30:05.236 --> 00:30:09.016
So irrespective of what the natural gas supply chain

549
00:30:09.056 --> 00:30:11.596
looks like and how much LNG there is in the mix,

550
00:30:12.496 --> 00:30:16.366
this development will always be lower carbon than an

551
00:30:16.396 --> 00:30:19.036
existing unabated, generator.

552
00:30:20.508 --> 00:30:24.328
Okay. Thank you. Um, I will, probably come back to Dr Boswell in a

553
00:30:24.368 --> 00:30:26.728
moment, but I just wanted to pick up on a couple of points there that you raised.

554
00:30:26.738 --> 00:30:28.828
And I, I know we're talking a bit about methane leakage.

555
00:30:28.848 --> 00:30:31.548
I'd like to come onto that next if that's okay, then come back to that.

556
00:30:31.568 --> 00:30:35.168
But, I noted you said that Uniper is

557
00:30:35.188 --> 00:30:38.778
responsible for its sourcing, and I didn't understand if it was producing and

558
00:30:38.778 --> 00:30:41.988
abstracting, but collecting its own gas in the North Sea, and,

559
00:30:43.768 --> 00:30:47.508
then not necessarily arguing, but saying, you know, we, we are trying to obtain

560
00:30:47.868 --> 00:30:51.688
our own gas with less emissions. But going back to the point that

561
00:30:51.708 --> 00:30:54.628
Dr Boswell raised about, you know, you can't track molecules through the pipeline.

562
00:30:54.668 --> 00:30:57.728
So I, I, it may be that, you know, you're, you're very admirably

563
00:30:58.488 --> 00:31:01.728
trying to use a less intensive emitter of gas from a

564
00:31:01.768 --> 00:31:05.468
location. What comes to you in the pipe may be the one that's arrived by

565
00:31:05.528 --> 00:31:08.488
ship, port. But so I'll just pick up on that.

566
00:31:08.528 --> 00:31:11.988
But, so we can't track the individual molecules, and I get that, and I get

567
00:31:12.588 --> 00:31:16.447
that, you know, th- what you've been saying to me about how the plant will be a

568
00:31:16.498 --> 00:31:20.288
prioritized and dispatchable power again because it's, it's already

a, a

569
00:31:20.408 --> 00:31:23.588
lower impact. And, so thank you for all that.

570
00:31:24.028 --> 00:31:27.378
I would like to move on to methane leakage as well now if it--
'cause we just sort

571
00:31:27.388 --> 00:31:29.068
of touched on that. So is that okay with yourself, doctor?

572
00:31:29.078 --> 00:31:31.368
'Cause I'm just gonna cover off on the methane leakage, or is there
something you

573
00:31:31.428 --> 00:31:34.908
wanted to come back to about, just to close off the topic on

574
00:31:35.328 --> 00:31:39.288
upstream emissions? Um, accepting we will do methane

575
00:31:39.328 --> 00:31:40.838
leakage next. Right.

576
00:31:40.848 --> 00:31:44.478
Th-thanks, sir. Yeah. Yeah. I'm Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate

577
00:31:44.588 --> 00:31:48.388
Emergency Science and Law. I would like to come back, if

578
00:31:48.528 --> 00:31:51.808
I may, before we move on.

579
00:31:51.818 --> 00:31:51.818
Yeah.

580
00:31:51.908 --> 00:31:55.728
Um, first of all, on the, the issue of

581
00:31:56.088 --> 00:31:57.788

Norway,

582
00:31:59.628 --> 00:32:02.348
I have tried in my,

583
00:32:02.708 --> 00:32:04.608
submission,

584
00:32:06.168 --> 00:32:08.728
to, you know, provide all the evidence base that

585
00:32:09.568 --> 00:32:13.048
w-what the applicants claim on Norwegian

586
00:32:13.168 --> 00:32:16.928
gas, being sort of predominant or whatever

587
00:32:16.988 --> 00:32:19.948
out into the future is incorrect. I want to say quite

588
00:32:20.048 --> 00:32:23.808
clearly that, you know, my position is that

589
00:32:23.928 --> 00:32:26.708
that is incorrect. That is

590
00:32:26.788 --> 00:32:30.048
i-i-i-i-i-i-is wrong in the environmental

591
00:32:30.228 --> 00:32:34.128
assessment, and that we need

592
00:32:34.188 --> 00:32:37.408
to look at the Neso figures. And I, I've reproduced the

593
00:32:37.468 --> 00:32:40.348
graph on page,

594
00:32:41.148 --> 00:32:44.178
um...

595
00:32:45.428 --> 00:32:46.328
Sorry. Okay.

596
00:32:47.688 --> 00:32:51.548
Let's find it. I-i-in my, latest representation,

597
00:32:51.568 --> 00:32:55.508
it's page nine. I've reproduced the Neso graph and all the

598
00:32:55.588 --> 00:32:59.368
numbers behind that. Um, I don't know if you're able

599
00:32:59.448 --> 00:33:01.148
to see that graph.

600
00:33:01.908 --> 00:33:05.048
Um, well, like I say, what I will do is I will obviously,

601
00:33:06.608 --> 00:33:09.977
read... I have read your submissions that you've given to me already. I have.

602
00:33:09.988 --> 00:33:13.648
I'm aware. But I'll be honest with you, I mean, I woke up this morning to the news

603
00:33:13.728 --> 00:33:17.208
that NTSA are saying that in the future it's forty percent

604
00:33:17.348 --> 00:33:21.318
LNG, and, OEUK is saying it's gonna be sixty per...

605
00:33:21.348 --> 00:33:24.888
So it's, it's a moving feast. And what we're looking to do here, I think, is,

606
00:33:25.648 --> 00:33:26.788
you're trying to predict the future.

607
00:33:26.828 --> 00:33:30.417
If you know exactly how much LNG is coming in the future, please let

us all know.

608
00:33:30.448 --> 00:33:31.648
That'd be very useful.

609
00:33:31.688 --> 00:33:32.298
Yeah. Well, that, that's-

610
00:33:32.298 --> 00:33:36.208
But what I think is fair to say is, you know, you're raising this concern

611
00:33:36.248 --> 00:33:39.708
about the assumption that has been made in the assessment is

612
00:33:39.868 --> 00:33:42.697
sensitive, and I think that is a reasonable assumption. Yeah.

613
00:33:42.728 --> 00:33:46.668
And go back to the client and say, "Can we challenge you that what if

614
00:33:47.668 --> 00:33:48.108
your

615
00:33:50.468 --> 00:33:54.388
gas comes from somewhere else in the future, what does your

616
00:33:54.428 --> 00:33:57.148
emissions look like?" And I think, you know, it really is-- I, I don't want to get

617
00:33:57.168 --> 00:34:00.488
into too much detail because I don't think we necessarily need to, but I think

618
00:34:00.528 --> 00:34:04.248
that's where I'm-- that's, that's my line of questioning is if, if

619
00:34:04.388 --> 00:34:04.727
your

620
00:34:05.628 --> 00:34:09.428
future delivery supply comes from somewhere different that is more carbon or

621
00:34:09.488 --> 00:34:13.428
methane intensive, what is the sensitivity of that and what does your

622
00:34:13.468 --> 00:34:16.548
potential emission, rate look like?

623
00:34:16.848 --> 00:34:19.808
Is that fair to say? That, that's, that's the route I'd like to pursue, I think.

624
00:34:19.819 --> 00:34:23.028
And, and not necessarily... 'Cause I, I appreciate you have given me a, a wide

625
00:34:23.089 --> 00:34:26.348
range of evidence to say that, and it would seem to be backed up by some of the

626
00:34:26.368 --> 00:34:28.089
evidence I've seen this morning also.

627
00:34:28.109 --> 00:34:31.609
But, th-that pot-potentially future LNG

628
00:34:32.028 --> 00:34:35.028
demand may grow. Uh, and, and who knows what's gonna happen

629
00:34:36.609 --> 00:34:40.368
tomorrow with, the Middle East. But, yeah.

630
00:34:40.468 --> 00:34:43.109
You know, it's very, it's very dynamic and volatile, and I think, I think you're

631
00:34:43.169 --> 00:34:46.388
right to draw my attention to that and say, basing it on one assumption.

632
00:34:46.408 --> 00:34:49.988
What I'm interested in is if everybody's doing that, does it

633
00:34:50.028 --> 00:34:51.908
matter? Because as everybody moves.

634
00:34:51.988 --> 00:34:55.468
Or actually, no, it's specific for Connors Quay because, and

635
00:34:55.528 --> 00:34:59.228
therefore it may be that you may be a very significant

636
00:34:59.288 --> 00:35:02.768
carbon emitter in the future for this very subtle change.

637
00:35:02.788 --> 00:35:04.368
That's the bit I'm trying to get my head around.

638
00:35:04.388 --> 00:35:05.428
Mm-hmm.

639
00:35:07.488 --> 00:35:11.218
Y-yes. Thank you. Thank you, sir. I'm Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate

640
00:35:11.268 --> 00:35:14.648
Emergency Science and Law. Yes. That, that, that, th-thank you very much.

641
00:35:14.688 --> 00:35:18.548
That was really helpful. If we won't go into the detail, I

642
00:35:18.588 --> 00:35:22.148
just wanted to highlight that Norwegian claim in

643
00:35:22.208 --> 00:35:26.158
my view is false. But, I, I agree with

644
00:35:26.228 --> 00:35:29.588
exactly what you say, really. It's about the uncertainty-

645
00:35:30.208 --> 00:35:30.348
Yeah

646
00:35:30.468 --> 00:35:33.308
... and how we assess that for the environmental impact

647
00:35:33.408 --> 00:35:36.988
assessment. And I do go back to the legal

648
00:35:37.228 --> 00:35:40.788
framework I set out in section two, A, in page

649
00:35:40.948 --> 00:35:44.288
four of my submission. I mean, very

650
00:35:44.568 --> 00:35:48.448
briefly, s- you'll be well familiar with the DIA regs,

651
00:35:48.508 --> 00:35:51.708
but, you know, you have to identify and describe and

652
00:35:51.768 --> 00:35:55.008
assess the likely significant impacts of the

653
00:35:55.068 --> 00:35:58.348
development, and you have to take into account

654
00:35:58.428 --> 00:36:01.028
cur-current knowledge and methods of assessment.

655
00:36:01.048 --> 00:36:02.668
And my,

656
00:36:04.448 --> 00:36:08.358
you know, position here is purely based on whether

657
00:36:08.388 --> 00:36:12.068
that's being done right. So

658
00:36:12.148 --> 00:36:15.698

it's not an issue of whether it

659
00:36:15.768 --> 00:36:19.322
affectsOther power stations. I

660
00:36:19.372 --> 00:36:22.362
mean, I, I, I agree entirely. It, it affects, you know,

661
00:36:23.132 --> 00:36:26.452
u-u-unabated power stations as much as abated

662
00:36:26.512 --> 00:36:30.332
pow-power stations being, being brought through, the planning

663
00:36:30.452 --> 00:36:33.651
system. But the, the point is that the

664
00:36:33.732 --> 00:36:37.692
developer... Sorry, the dec- the point is the decision maker must
have

665
00:36:37.772 --> 00:36:41.452
the full knowledge of the project's likely significant,

666
00:36:41.772 --> 00:36:45.532
effects, and that brings in, you know, the Rochdale envelope

667
00:36:45.592 --> 00:36:49.352
and the, the, the Milne case around, two

668
00:36:49.451 --> 00:36:53.132
thousand and, and, and so on. And, and my current

669
00:36:53.232 --> 00:36:55.251
position is that the EIA

670
00:36:56.132 --> 00:36:58.932
lacks current knowledge and methods of assessment,

671
00:37:00.032 --> 00:37:03.392
it fails to consider the short-term methane effects,

672
00:37:03.992 --> 00:37:07.792
and it fails to, assess the reasonable worst case scenarios across

673
00:37:07.832 --> 00:37:11.612
all three parameters. I know we're talking at the moment about the upstream

674
00:37:11.672 --> 00:37:12.792
emissions.

675
00:37:12.832 --> 00:37:14.832
Yeah. So thank you. Uh, that's, that's helpful.

676
00:37:14.872 --> 00:37:17.302
I think, you know, I understand that. I understand where...

677
00:37:17.312 --> 00:37:19.902
I think my line of questioning is gonna go to the applicant in the future, and

678
00:37:19.952 --> 00:37:22.472
obviously they'll reply to your evidence submitted as well.

679
00:37:22.492 --> 00:37:25.772
But I think I understand where I'm trying to inquire of more

680
00:37:25.812 --> 00:37:29.592
information. Does, is there anything you wish to follow up from that first item

681
00:37:29.632 --> 00:37:33.432
about upstream emissions before we move on to methane leakage?

682
00:37:34.792 --> 00:37:35.292
Ben Murray

683
00:37:36.112 --> 00:37:39.832
for the applicant. Uh, yeah, just to reiterate again

684
00:37:39.932 --> 00:37:43.512

to agree with, Dr. Boswell about the inherent uncertainty-

685
00:37:43.572 --> 00:37:43.632
Yeah

686
00:37:43.692 --> 00:37:47.472
... about the future gas supply, as you noted from the media coverage at the

687
00:37:47.512 --> 00:37:48.592
moment. Um,

688
00:37:50.052 --> 00:37:54.012
the fact that any changes in the upstream gas

689
00:37:54.052 --> 00:37:57.872
supply will affect all consumers equally, and it will only

690
00:37:57.912 --> 00:38:00.192
affect their upstream scope three emissions.

691
00:38:00.212 --> 00:38:00.632
Yeah.

692
00:38:00.712 --> 00:38:03.972
If you've got... Once again, if you've got abated and

693
00:38:04.012 --> 00:38:07.872
unabated, then the abated one will be dispatched earlier and will have

694
00:38:07.912 --> 00:38:11.132
substantially lower overall emissions, notwithstanding

695
00:38:11.912 --> 00:38:14.032
any increases in the upstream supply chain.

696
00:38:14.092 --> 00:38:17.652
Yes, in the event of there being increased

697
00:38:17.792 --> 00:38:18.812

LNG content

698
00:38:19.972 --> 00:38:23.902
in the UK natural gas mix, all we can

699
00:38:23.952 --> 00:38:26.912
say is the water tank factor will be higher.

700
00:38:26.951 --> 00:38:30.412
How much higher, we can't say because there are other variables that we would have

701
00:38:30.472 --> 00:38:34.252
to factor in and, and I don't think it's practicable at the

702
00:38:34.312 --> 00:38:38.012
moment. So what would be the overall share between Norway and UK

703
00:38:38.332 --> 00:38:40.932
and LNG? How much LNG? How much Norway?

704
00:38:40.952 --> 00:38:42.412
We don't know.

705
00:38:42.452 --> 00:38:44.842
Thank you. Um, I- I'm gonna move on in a minute, but I'm just...

706
00:38:44.852 --> 00:38:47.372
Yeah, just need something. I, I think thank you again for drawing attention to

707
00:38:47.412 --> 00:38:51.252
that. Thank you because I think on, on all parties 'cause, you know, there is that

708
00:38:51.312 --> 00:38:53.712
uncertainty. I understand completely what you're saying as well, Dr.

709
00:38:53.732 --> 00:38:56.482
Boswell, that the EIA should consider the, the worst case scenario.

710

00:38:56.512 --> 00:39:00.272
So I will process that and come back to you in, in writing w-with

711
00:39:00.332 --> 00:39:03.812
that. I'm gonna move on to methane leakage as, as you already alluded to a little

712
00:39:03.852 --> 00:39:06.152
bit in, in, the conversation we've already had, Mr.

713
00:39:06.172 --> 00:39:08.672
Murray, and also going back to Dr. Boswell again.

714
00:39:08.712 --> 00:39:10.642
I'll, I'll come to the applicant first and then back to Dr.

715
00:39:10.652 --> 00:39:14.452
Boswell, if that's okay. But just my understanding from what I've read of the

716
00:39:14.512 --> 00:39:15.692
evidence that's been submitted to me

717
00:39:16.552 --> 00:39:19.932
is, and as you pointed out just a moment ago, is that

718
00:39:21.872 --> 00:39:25.852
shorter scale methane assessment is-- should be undertaken

719
00:39:25.872 --> 00:39:28.732
because the hundred-year assessment, the long-term assessment,

720
00:39:29.852 --> 00:39:32.992
has a significantly different impact over a shorter horizon being

721
00:39:33.032 --> 00:39:36.892
considered. So I think, again, correct me if I'm

722
00:39:36.912 --> 00:39:39.452
wrong, what, what, what I have read from the evidence that I've

723

00:39:41.392 --> 00:39:42.892
received is

724
00:39:43.692 --> 00:39:45.012
there is likely to be

725
00:39:46.052 --> 00:39:49.872
a higher consequence of methane leakage in the,

726
00:39:49.912 --> 00:39:53.412
effectively the upstream emissions of this over a shorter term horizon of which

727
00:39:53.422 --> 00:39:57.092
this project is relatively short term compared to something like

728
00:39:57.152 --> 00:40:00.461
a, a hundred-year design life. This is like a thirty-year design life.

729
00:40:00.592 --> 00:40:02.792
So I think what

730
00:40:03.852 --> 00:40:07.552
has been requested is could an assessment be made of the short term

731
00:40:07.852 --> 00:40:11.192
methane leakage and its consequences over a shorter

732
00:40:11.202 --> 00:40:14.492
horizon? So to the applicant first, if that's okay, and let me know, and I'll come

733
00:40:14.532 --> 00:40:15.122
back to Dr.

734
00:40:15.352 --> 00:40:18.532
Ben Murray for the applicant. Uh, yes, sir.

735
00:40:18.572 --> 00:40:22.272
It is, it is noted and accepted that different greenhouse gases have

736
00:40:22.372 --> 00:40:24.032
got different warming potentials,

737
00:40:25.072 --> 00:40:28.992
and those warming potentials are also variable over different time

738
00:40:29.032 --> 00:40:31.222
horizons, and that's, that's, you know,

739
00:40:32.492 --> 00:40:35.792
not in-- that is not con- attested

740
00:40:36.112 --> 00:40:39.772
anywhere here. Uh, and methane, as we've noted, is a

741
00:40:39.792 --> 00:40:41.332
short-lived gas. Um,

742
00:40:43.092 --> 00:40:46.912
the standard approach for carbon accounting, both nationally

743
00:40:47.092 --> 00:40:50.962
within the UK and internationally under the auspices of the UN Framework

744
00:40:51.012 --> 00:40:54.792
Convention on Climate Change and the Paris Agreement, is to apply a one

745
00:40:54.852 --> 00:40:58.432
hundred-year, global warming potential.

746
00:40:58.452 --> 00:41:02.272
And that has been applied because it is the best way

747
00:41:02.332 --> 00:41:05.952
to reflect the long-term warming impact of the cumulative

748
00:41:05.992 --> 00:41:09.652
emissions of carbon dioxide, which is the dominant

749
00:41:09.752 --> 00:41:12.352
gas when it comes to long-term warming.

750
00:41:12.392 --> 00:41:15.632
So if your ambition is to restrict

751
00:41:16.092 --> 00:41:19.812
long-term warming, then that is the appropriate metric to

752
00:41:19.992 --> 00:41:23.452
use. So for better or worse, that is the factor that has been

753
00:41:23.492 --> 00:41:27.212
adopted, and it feeds through into all of our carbon accounting

754
00:41:27.252 --> 00:41:28.632
systems. So

755
00:41:30.732 --> 00:41:33.872
it influences specifically and explicitly the

756
00:41:33.952 --> 00:41:37.332
annual emissions factors that are, are published

757
00:41:37.392 --> 00:41:41.212
by the, the government that had been used in this assessment, and
that

758
00:41:41.292 --> 00:41:44.032
is, that is made clear in the methodology

759
00:41:44.272 --> 00:41:47.712
statement. They influence the

760
00:41:48.812 --> 00:41:52.672
generation of carbon budgets, the legally binding statutory carbon

761
00:41:52.732 --> 00:41:55.982
budgets that apply in the UK and the devolved

762

00:41:56.092 --> 00:42:00.012
administrations advised by the Committee on Climate Change and,

763
00:42:00.192 --> 00:42:04.012
ratified, by Parliament. Um, and they apply

764
00:42:04.472 --> 00:42:08.372
for the UK's submissions to the UNFCC

765
00:42:09.232 --> 00:42:12.532
in terms of our national emissions inventories.

766
00:42:12.592 --> 00:42:12.772
So

767
00:42:14.092 --> 00:42:17.512
yes, while it is true that a shorter

768
00:42:18.372 --> 00:42:21.412
global warming potential time horizon for methane would

769
00:42:21.492 --> 00:42:25.144
resultIn higher emissions for the proposed

770
00:42:25.264 --> 00:42:28.864
development. The question that I would put back to, to Dr

771
00:42:28.944 --> 00:42:32.174
Boswell and anybody else is what do you do with that figure?

772
00:42:33.004 --> 00:42:36.804
Because all of the pathways to net zero that

773
00:42:36.864 --> 00:42:40.744
our guidance requires us to contextualize our emissions

774
00:42:40.804 --> 00:42:44.744
against have all been developed on the basis of a

775
00:42:44.804 --> 00:42:48.724
one hundred year time horizon. So not only is

776
00:42:48.764 --> 00:42:52.524
it a higher figure, it's a higher and qualitatively different

777
00:42:52.584 --> 00:42:52.924
figure

778
00:42:53.924 --> 00:42:56.064
like that can no longer be compared-

779
00:42:56.144 --> 00:42:56.194
Yeah.

780
00:42:56.194 --> 00:42:57.844
-to you and to our national

781
00:42:57.904 --> 00:43:00.464
budgets.

782
00:43:01.524 --> 00:43:02.804
Okay. Thank you. So

783
00:43:04.164 --> 00:43:07.004
I'm just trying to get this summarized in my head again.

784
00:43:07.064 --> 00:43:07.884
There's an acknowledgement

785
00:43:09.564 --> 00:43:09.804
that

786
00:43:12.784 --> 00:43:16.024
the leakage of methane from the

787
00:43:16.544 --> 00:43:20.284
abstraction, production, transmission of the natural

788
00:43:20.364 --> 00:43:20.764
gas

789

00:43:22.304 --> 00:43:22.964
is higher

790
00:43:24.044 --> 00:43:27.663
and more impactful in the shorter term than the longer term horizon. I suppose.

791
00:43:27.684 --> 00:43:29.384
So we, so we agree that that, that is

792
00:43:29.904 --> 00:43:32.444
fact.

793
00:43:34.564 --> 00:43:37.874
What you're saying to me is the policy and approach that you're taking to use is

794
00:43:37.944 --> 00:43:41.104
over a longer horizon 'cause it's predicated on the carbon dioxide

795
00:43:41.144 --> 00:43:44.634
component, and that's everything that we're comparing like for

796
00:43:44.684 --> 00:43:45.864
like and

797
00:43:47.724 --> 00:43:50.884
carbon budget trading and, and carbon accounting for.

798
00:43:52.504 --> 00:43:54.284
It would be possible to assess

799
00:43:55.304 --> 00:43:58.844
the methane leakage rates over a shorter horizon, but you would have

800
00:43:59.044 --> 00:44:02.344
nothing to compare them to or use them usefully,

801
00:44:04.884 --> 00:44:07.984
to use as a, a carbon trading tool, for want of a better word.

802

00:44:08.064 --> 00:44:08.284
So

803
00:44:09.524 --> 00:44:11.894
okay. I think I got all that. Um,

804
00:44:15.024 --> 00:44:18.944
I'm also conscious about moving away from standard approaches

805
00:44:19.364 --> 00:44:22.844
and government policy, which is beyond the remit of this,

806
00:44:23.404 --> 00:44:27.294
examination. Dr Boswell, would you like to come in on any of the points that Mr

807
00:44:27.484 --> 00:44:29.644
Murray's just raised?

808
00:44:29.704 --> 00:44:33.304
Yes. Thank you, sir. Uh, Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency

809
00:44:33.424 --> 00:44:35.924
Science and Law. Um,

810
00:44:38.084 --> 00:44:39.264
yeah. Um,

811
00:44:40.384 --> 00:44:44.144
I, I think I'd like to just,

812
00:44:44.804 --> 00:44:46.984
emphasize the materiality

813
00:44:48.224 --> 00:44:52.174
of the short-term impacts. Um,

814
00:44:53.204 --> 00:44:56.824
and th-th-this is all in

815
00:44:56.884 --> 00:45:00.794

my, my document, but there's three key things

816
00:45:00.864 --> 00:45:04.174
really, to emphasize. The,

817
00:45:06.164 --> 00:45:09.413
methane has already made a substantial

818
00:45:09.444 --> 00:45:13.104
contribution to the observed anthropogenic warming to

819
00:45:13.184 --> 00:45:16.684
date. Um, and specifically on,

820
00:45:16.964 --> 00:45:19.124
page thirty-four, bullet

821
00:45:20.204 --> 00:45:22.224
a hundred and fifty-eight of my s-

822
00:45:23.244 --> 00:45:24.724
deadline free submission,

823
00:45:26.084 --> 00:45:29.604
I point to the IPCC data on

824
00:45:29.664 --> 00:45:32.764
that. Um, it's approximately point five of the

825
00:45:32.774 --> 00:45:35.684
degree of, at that time-

826
00:45:35.753 --> 00:45:35.753
Yes.

827
00:45:35.944 --> 00:45:38.684
-one point o seven degree warming.

828
00:45:38.693 --> 00:45:38.714
Um-

829
00:45:38.744 --> 00:45:41.904
I, I, I don't think we're, you know, we're, we're di- you know, I don't think, I

830
00:45:41.924 --> 00:45:43.864
don't, I don't think the applicant's disputing any of that, and I think, you know,

831
00:45:43.884 --> 00:45:44.874
the, the, the-

832
00:45:44.884 --> 00:45:45.114
Right.

833
00:45:45.114 --> 00:45:48.844
-the science around climate change and, and, and, and the evidence of change is

834
00:45:49.344 --> 00:45:52.014
certainly something I'm, I'm aware of and been working in for a long period of

835
00:45:52.044 --> 00:45:55.384
time. But what we were, I think, trying to get to there

836
00:45:56.044 --> 00:45:59.354
is the method, you know, and, and I don't think we're disputing that methane is

837
00:45:59.424 --> 00:46:01.864
particularly damaging and particularly damaging over a short horizon.

838
00:46:03.084 --> 00:46:03.094
Mm.

839
00:46:03.124 --> 00:46:06.904
So the me-materially, I don't think you have to point that out to the examination.

840
00:46:06.913 --> 00:46:06.913
Mm.

841
00:46:06.924 --> 00:46:08.964
I think you've done that in your evidence, and, and I think-

842
00:46:09.164 --> 00:46:09.184
Mm

843
00:46:09.664 --> 00:46:11.224
...we're, we're in agreement with that.

844
00:46:12.184 --> 00:46:15.784
What we're trying to say is the, the method of assessment of the methane

845
00:46:15.844 --> 00:46:16.504
damage-

846
00:46:16.544 --> 00:46:16.834
Mm-hmm.

847
00:46:17.704 --> 00:46:20.584
We're con- we're con- the applicant is advising me they're being con-

848
00:46:20.804 --> 00:46:23.114
To answer that more directly. Thank, thank you, sir.

849
00:46:23.114 --> 00:46:26.404
Uh, Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency Science

850
00:46:26.564 --> 00:46:30.444
Law. Um, what I'm

851
00:46:30.624 --> 00:46:33.664
saying, and let me tell you this quite clearly, is I'm not

852
00:46:34.404 --> 00:46:38.284
challenging, first of all, this sort of goes back to our last section.

853
00:46:38.294 --> 00:46:39.944

I'm not challenging the use

854
00:46:40.984 --> 00:46:42.223
of the government

855
00:46:43.144 --> 00:46:46.784
WTT factor. I'm just saying

856
00:46:46.964 --> 00:46:49.624
that there's an uncertainty associated with

857
00:46:49.684 --> 00:46:53.524
that, and that that

858
00:46:53.584 --> 00:46:57.444
uncertainty and the reasonable worst case which comes from it hasn't been

859
00:46:57.464 --> 00:47:01.244
assessed. So I'm saying you start with the WTT

860
00:47:01.364 --> 00:47:05.244
factor, and then what I consider

861
00:47:05.284 --> 00:47:09.244
is needed is that you need a sensitivity test on top of

862
00:47:09.264 --> 00:47:12.944
that. Now that, that covers the point from the previous part.

863
00:47:12.984 --> 00:47:16.944
When we come onto the short-term methane, I'm saying

864
00:47:16.984 --> 00:47:19.364
then you have a second sensitivity

865
00:47:19.424 --> 00:47:22.604
test, which brings in the, the

866
00:47:22.864 --> 00:47:26.044
GP, the GWP twenty

867
00:47:26.404 --> 00:47:26.934
factor

868
00:47:28.184 --> 00:47:29.504
to assess

869
00:47:30.724 --> 00:47:33.944
or, or, or, or rather so to, to at this point to identify and

870
00:47:34.024 --> 00:47:36.744
describe the likely,

871
00:47:37.724 --> 00:47:41.184
significant impacts of the reasonable worst case for, for those

872
00:47:41.224 --> 00:47:45.144
effects. So that's my... See, I'm not actually saying

873
00:47:45.204 --> 00:47:49.044
you get rid of the, the f- the, the, the existing factor at all.

874
00:47:49.064 --> 00:47:52.904
I'm saying you build stepwise sensitivity tests, and this

875
00:47:52.964 --> 00:47:55.984
one for the near term climate effects is the

876
00:47:56.044 --> 00:47:58.854
second of those sensitivity tests.

877
00:47:58.904 --> 00:48:02.824
Now, how do you, do something with that?

878
00:48:02.884 --> 00:48:06.524
That was, you know, from Mr Murray. That was Mr Murray's question.

879
00:48:06.684 --> 00:48:08.804
What do you do with that if you do it?

880

00:48:08.884 --> 00:48:12.764
A, a, a very fair question. Now, I would

881
00:48:12.884 --> 00:48:15.243
say that the IEMA

882
00:48:15.904 --> 00:48:19.764
guidance, the twenty twenty-two IE- IEMA

883
00:48:19.844 --> 00:48:23.784
guidance on greenhouse gas, assessment, can't remember the

884
00:48:23.804 --> 00:48:26.584
exact title, but I'm sure you know the document that I'm referring

885
00:48:26.664 --> 00:48:29.914
to. Um-Addresses

886
00:48:29.984 --> 00:48:33.704
contextualization alongside

887
00:48:33.804 --> 00:48:37.644
the assessment and the assessment of significance.

888
00:48:37.664 --> 00:48:41.444
And that, I believe, is the point where if you do the

889
00:48:41.464 --> 00:48:44.644
sensitivity test exercise I'm talking about

890
00:48:45.484 --> 00:48:49.324
with a GWP twenty, you'd say, "Ah, we're

891
00:48:49.404 --> 00:48:52.184
seeing this additional near-term

892
00:48:52.964 --> 00:48:56.584
climate impacts on the system in, in, in ten

893
00:48:56.684 --> 00:49:00.484
years, twenty years sort of timescales,

894
00:49:00.584 --> 00:49:04.133
and that this is very materially, physically,

895
00:49:04.184 --> 00:49:08.124
scientifically relevant." Um,

896
00:49:08.204 --> 00:49:11.944
and that's the contextualization, you could

897
00:49:12.004 --> 00:49:14.744
then give to that sensitivity test.

898
00:49:14.764 --> 00:49:16.984
You'd use it as contextualization

899
00:49:17.784 --> 00:49:20.984
for the, for the final assessment and the final

900
00:49:21.064 --> 00:49:22.344
decision.

901
00:49:22.404 --> 00:49:22.684
Okay.

902
00:49:22.704 --> 00:49:22.874
Um-

903
00:49:22.884 --> 00:49:25.974
Thank you for that. So actually, again, just to get my head around that and what

904
00:49:26.004 --> 00:49:29.434
you've just said, I un-understand, I understand, you know, again, we've

905
00:49:29.444 --> 00:49:32.824
been talking a little bit on the Rochdale envelope and us looking at the range of

906
00:49:32.864 --> 00:49:36.264

scenarios that might occur for this site and this issue

907
00:49:36.504 --> 00:49:38.424
specifically around climate change.

908
00:49:38.504 --> 00:49:41.394
Um, and I understand, you know, the challenge about what you're, what you're-- I

909
00:49:41.404 --> 00:49:44.684
think if I get to the, to the nub of it, is you're, you're challenging the

910
00:49:44.744 --> 00:49:46.244
uncertainty on future

911
00:49:47.524 --> 00:49:50.974
supply really, and it, and, and that's, that's a, you know,

912
00:49:51.604 --> 00:49:54.124
that's a, that's a, that's a difficult egg to, to crack, isn't it?

913
00:49:54.184 --> 00:49:57.894
But, I'll come back to the applicant in a

914
00:49:57.964 --> 00:50:01.124
moment. But what I think I'm still coming back to this point, and it's a bit like

915
00:50:01.144 --> 00:50:03.464
the emission scenario of,

916
00:50:05.224 --> 00:50:08.924
yes, the gas may come from somewhere else, but it'll come from somewhere else for

917
00:50:08.984 --> 00:50:12.904
everyone. Yes, this project should assess on

918
00:50:12.944 --> 00:50:15.784
its own merits, so it shouldn't take into account what everyone else is doing.

919
00:50:15.804 --> 00:50:18.034
But should the EIA should consider its own,

920
00:50:18.084 --> 00:50:21.544
envelope of factors

921
00:50:21.884 --> 00:50:24.804
and, and make sure that it's allowing for all the worst case

922
00:50:26.404 --> 00:50:30.064
aspects of all of that. The methane

923
00:50:30.184 --> 00:50:31.184
leakage rate

924
00:50:32.564 --> 00:50:36.504
is worse over the shorter term. It would be possible

925
00:50:36.924 --> 00:50:40.644
to assess that impact over the shorter term, but it would make it incredibly

926
00:50:40.684 --> 00:50:44.644
difficult to compare to any other project of a similar

927
00:50:44.684 --> 00:50:47.844
nature to say, is it worse or better than this project?

928
00:50:47.864 --> 00:50:51.434
Because it's not done elsewhere. So can I come back to Mr.

929
00:50:51.464 --> 00:50:54.724
Murray and just say if I got my head around that bit correctly or not?

930
00:50:56.104 --> 00:51:00.064
Ben Murray for the applicant. Uh, I think that's a fair summary, sir. Yeah.

931
00:51:00.104 --> 00:51:03.484

So just to, again, unpack this a little bit.

932
00:51:03.504 --> 00:51:07.484
Number one, yes, you would have a higher number if

933
00:51:07.524 --> 00:51:08.644
you were to apply-

934
00:51:08.744 --> 00:51:08.754
Yeah

935
00:51:08.864 --> 00:51:11.964
... a shorter time horizon for methane. That's not in doubt.

936
00:51:12.044 --> 00:51:14.504
Uh, and that's technically possible.

937
00:51:14.524 --> 00:51:16.804
But as we said, that figure would not be

938
00:51:18.144 --> 00:51:22.004
comparable to any of, of, any of those bigger picture numbers like

939
00:51:22.124 --> 00:51:26.064
UK carbon budgets. And number two, it would apply to

940
00:51:26.144 --> 00:51:29.824
all users of gas equally. So it would apply to the unabated gas that would have

941
00:51:29.864 --> 00:51:31.304
higher overall emissions-

942
00:51:31.464 --> 00:51:31.754
Okay

943
00:51:31.754 --> 00:51:32.504
... for doing the same-

944
00:51:33.384 --> 00:51:33.644
Thank you

945
00:51:33.744 --> 00:51:34.804
... structural power.

946
00:51:34.824 --> 00:51:36.644
I thank you. But I would just go back to Dr.

947
00:51:36.664 --> 00:51:37.684
Boswell's point about

948
00:51:39.524 --> 00:51:42.964
g- looking at your Rochdale envelope and considering your worst case scenarios of

949
00:51:43.044 --> 00:51:44.524
all of your factors. But I, I understand.

950
00:51:44.544 --> 00:51:48.484
So I, I've, I think I've got enough information now for me to succinctly

951
00:51:48.544 --> 00:51:51.944
try and put that in a question to you later, perhaps, but also... So thank you.

952
00:51:51.984 --> 00:51:55.094
I'm gonna move on to carbon capture now, which is I think the final point that

953
00:51:55.124 --> 00:51:57.204
we've, we've raised, Dr. Boswell.

954
00:51:57.214 --> 00:51:59.944
And I'm just gonna go back again to the applicant again if I can try and structure

955
00:52:00.024 --> 00:52:02.204
a question and see if I can get it answered and then come back to you for your

956
00:52:02.224 --> 00:52:03.044
opinion on that.

957
00:52:03.064 --> 00:52:07.004
Ex- excuse me, sir. I- is it possible just to say, two

958
00:52:07.044 --> 00:52:09.074
more things at this point very briefly-

959
00:52:10.524 --> 00:52:10.554
Okay, sure

960
00:52:10.564 --> 00:52:14.534
... on the short-term methane? Um, just to sort of,

961
00:52:15.304 --> 00:52:17.204
extend what I said about

962
00:52:17.224 --> 00:52:20.524
contextualization that,

963
00:52:21.204 --> 00:52:23.824
or, or, or what the last thing I said.

964
00:52:23.924 --> 00:52:27.784
Um, I, I think I'd go

965
00:52:27.844 --> 00:52:31.824
back one step further and say that, of course, all of this is

966
00:52:31.864 --> 00:52:34.404
going back to getting the full knowledge

967
00:52:35.204 --> 00:52:38.064
for the environmental impact assessment, and that

968
00:52:38.124 --> 00:52:42.044
contextualization is only sort of one if you

969
00:52:42.084 --> 00:52:45.844
like, one way of getting full knowledge, and I didn't track it right

970

00:52:45.944 --> 00:52:48.263
back to that. So I just wanted to make that clear.

971
00:52:48.284 --> 00:52:51.504
And the second thing on the, the effect of the

972
00:52:51.584 --> 00:52:54.944
short-term methane on the unabated gas

973
00:52:55.064 --> 00:52:56.404
system,

974
00:52:58.444 --> 00:53:01.824
I'd like to deal with that in the item four point

975
00:53:02.124 --> 00:53:06.004
two, which we come on to. But I just wanted to sort of,

976
00:53:06.064 --> 00:53:09.124
if you like, give a forward pointer at this stage that-

977
00:53:09.164 --> 00:53:09.244
Yeah

978
00:53:09.324 --> 00:53:09.354
...

979
00:53:10.924 --> 00:53:14.844
o-o-once you start applying these

980
00:53:14.924 --> 00:53:18.744
sensitivity tests, if you like, though th- th-- all I've done is

981
00:53:18.764 --> 00:53:21.424
indicative. I'm not saying I've got anything right-

982
00:53:21.464 --> 00:53:21.504
Yeah

983
00:53:21.584 --> 00:53:22.714
... or anything. I think you understand that.

984
00:53:22.714 --> 00:53:26.304
But, you know, once you start applying indicative sensitivity tests

985
00:53:26.664 --> 00:53:29.384
to that difference between the abated and the

986
00:53:29.464 --> 00:53:33.164
unabated, then the gain also

987
00:53:33.304 --> 00:53:36.844
starts to get less. We'll, we'll come back to that, if we may, at four point

988
00:53:37.244 --> 00:53:38.884
two, but I just wanted to sort of put forward-

989
00:53:38.904 --> 00:53:39.134
Again

990
00:53:39.134 --> 00:53:40.364
... a reference to that.

991
00:53:40.404 --> 00:53:41.104
I, I, I do understand-

992
00:53:41.124 --> 00:53:41.174
Thank you, sir

993
00:53:41.174 --> 00:53:43.634
... what you're saying, and I understand about the EIA process and the, and the,

994
00:53:43.644 --> 00:53:47.104
and the sensitivity testing and the of, of, of the scope of that we do.

995
00:53:47.184 --> 00:53:48.984
Similarly, yesterday we, we ha- we had a

996
00:53:50.084 --> 00:53:53.564

hearing on, on flood risk, and, you know, it's a, it's a very similar situation.

997
00:53:53.584 --> 00:53:56.524
There's, there's huge uncertainty into future sea level rise.

998
00:53:56.544 --> 00:53:59.134
We have to draw the line somewhere and make an assumption about what we think is

999
00:53:59.164 --> 00:54:03.024
the reasonable worst case. But with the acknowledgement that there's a residual

1000
00:54:03.084 --> 00:54:05.704
risk that we may have made those assumptions incorrectly.

1001
00:54:05.724 --> 00:54:09.584
For me, this feels very similar. There is an approved national,

1002
00:54:09.944 --> 00:54:13.384
international approach on how to make an assessment, but there's an acknowledgement

1003
00:54:13.424 --> 00:54:17.284
that some of those allowances that are used in those assessments may be

1004
00:54:17.324 --> 00:54:20.684
incorrect in the future. So I'm going to move on to carbon capture now, if I can.

1005
00:54:20.724 --> 00:54:24.194
Just finally address the comments that you raised to me that your, your, as it's,

1006
00:54:25.844 --> 00:54:27.924
sorry, y- climate

1007
00:54:27.984 --> 00:54:31.856
emergency science lawAre concerned that the ninety-five

1008

00:54:31.976 --> 00:54:35.696
percent assessed capture rate is not secured within the development

1009
00:54:35.756 --> 00:54:39.406
consent order, and that there is a concern that emissions may...

1010
00:54:39.436 --> 00:54:43.356
Or the, the use of an unabated plant may exceed that.

1011
00:54:43.366 --> 00:54:46.856
I appreciate what we talked about earlier with the upstream emissions and how you

1012
00:54:46.896 --> 00:54:50.436
were going to... The assumptions you made about five percent

1013
00:54:50.856 --> 00:54:54.756
being ineffectual, but if we could just touch on that topic, please, about

1014
00:54:54.856 --> 00:54:58.756
how you can reassure that you are applying

1015
00:54:58.816 --> 00:54:59.736
for a low carbon

1016
00:55:01.196 --> 00:55:02.316
c-carbon capture plant

1017
00:55:03.236 --> 00:55:05.176
and that you're going to actually use it.

1018
00:55:05.216 --> 00:55:08.716
I think we al-already touched on it in previous DCO hearings, but if we could just

1019
00:55:08.756 --> 00:55:11.766
very shortly go back over that and say how it's secured that it will be

1020
00:55:11.896 --> 00:55:12.986
used.

1021
00:55:14.176 --> 00:55:15.766
James Straughan for the applicant.

1022
00:55:15.836 --> 00:55:19.676
Uh, I, I'm hoping we can deal with this quite shortly.

1023
00:55:20.236 --> 00:55:23.996
Dr Boswell, in his initial representations, made

1024
00:55:24.076 --> 00:55:27.056
reference to some previous consents

1025
00:55:27.136 --> 00:55:30.436
where, this issue had been

1026
00:55:30.476 --> 00:55:34.296
raised, and i-in response, we have

1027
00:55:34.336 --> 00:55:38.216
amended the definition in

1028
00:55:38.276 --> 00:55:42.086
the draft DCO of the carbon dioxide

1029
00:55:42.176 --> 00:55:45.466
capture plant, which is now

1030
00:55:45.516 --> 00:55:49.366
defined in equivalent terms to the way

1031
00:55:49.416 --> 00:55:50.416
he requested.

1032
00:55:51.476 --> 00:55:55.116
Uh, ours is refers to the m-m- designed to capture a

1033
00:55:55.176 --> 00:55:57.376
minimum rate of ninety-five percent.

1034

00:55:57.436 --> 00:55:59.896
I think the previous one that he referred to was ninety

1035
00:55:59.936 --> 00:56:03.586
percent. So ours, we've got a h- a

1036
00:56:03.756 --> 00:56:07.686
more challenging design. Um, and we-- that's

1037
00:56:07.736 --> 00:56:10.756
also been reflected then in the way he

1038
00:56:10.816 --> 00:56:14.776
requested, in... Where it

1039
00:56:14.876 --> 00:56:18.556
is? Yes. Tw- article twenty-one. Is that what it was?

1040
00:56:18.596 --> 00:56:20.786
No, it's requirement twenty-one in schedule two.

1041
00:56:21.596 --> 00:56:23.616
Um, reque- as to when the

1042
00:56:24.516 --> 00:56:28.266
work one, number 1A, which is of course the plant, can be,

1043
00:56:28.496 --> 00:56:32.236
brought into commercial use without the other works, and that

1044
00:56:32.316 --> 00:56:35.196
follows the same request. So in a

1045
00:56:35.236 --> 00:56:39.096
nutshell, unless I'm mistaken, the, the thing that he

1046
00:56:39.136 --> 00:56:40.956
requested has been done.

1047
00:56:41.016 --> 00:56:42.676
Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that.

1048
00:56:42.756 --> 00:56:46.606
Uh, Dr Boswell, have you, obviously some, you know, appreciate we're,

1049
00:56:46.616 --> 00:56:50.456
we're very close to the deadline for resubmissions, with this hearing, but I

1050
00:56:50.476 --> 00:56:54.156
don't know if you had noted that and that the applicant is advising me that the

1051
00:56:54.196 --> 00:56:55.396
concern that you raised about

1052
00:56:56.656 --> 00:57:00.596
control of the operation of the facility and, achieving

1053
00:57:00.616 --> 00:57:04.576
the ninety-five percent assessed capture rate is now within the draft,

1054
00:57:04.856 --> 00:57:06.696
development consent order.

1055
00:57:07.556 --> 00:57:11.156
Thank you, sir. Yes. Uh, Dr Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency

1056
00:57:11.296 --> 00:57:13.396
Science Law. Um,

1057
00:57:14.756 --> 00:57:18.456
first of all, yeah, I pr-I appreciate, what, what Mr

1058
00:57:18.696 --> 00:57:22.196
Straughan has just said, and, thank the applicant for

1059
00:57:22.296 --> 00:57:25.756
changing the draft DCO. Um,

1060

00:57:26.356 --> 00:57:29.536
however, what's been added into the draft

1061
00:57:29.776 --> 00:57:33.736
DCO is only effectively the, the same

1062
00:57:34.176 --> 00:57:35.396
design intent

1063
00:57:36.476 --> 00:57:40.336
as is in the environmental statement and the

1064
00:57:40.416 --> 00:57:44.136
EIA, and it doesn't in any sense

1065
00:57:44.196 --> 00:57:47.856
secure the bounds of the reasonably foreseeable operational

1066
00:57:47.876 --> 00:57:51.166
performance across the project's life's,

1067
00:57:52.936 --> 00:57:55.946
cycle. And I did actually appro--

1068
00:57:56.656 --> 00:58:00.456
a-address this in my submission three, before I

1069
00:58:00.496 --> 00:58:03.806
knew that the, the draft DCO had been changed in fact.

1070
00:58:04.316 --> 00:58:06.785
Uh, bullet, two hundred and

1071
00:58:07.016 --> 00:58:09.376
six, which is page

1072
00:58:09.396 --> 00:58:12.696
forty-four. So essentially I'm just saying it,

1073
00:58:13.496 --> 00:58:15.966
yes, the draft DCO may or may not be changed.

1074
00:58:15.996 --> 00:58:19.936
It has been changed now. Um, but that doesn't establish the

1075
00:58:19.996 --> 00:58:21.936
operational performance,

1076
00:58:22.816 --> 00:58:26.176
which is what we need really for the Rochdale

1077
00:58:26.276 --> 00:58:29.306
and reasonably foreseeable operating

1078
00:58:29.356 --> 00:58:33.116
modes. Um, what I

1079
00:58:33.216 --> 00:58:36.836
also, have drawn attention

1080
00:58:36.996 --> 00:58:40.416
to, i-in, in, in that,

1081
00:58:41.456 --> 00:58:42.936
d-deadline free submission

1082
00:58:43.916 --> 00:58:47.716
is that, my position is that the future environmental

1083
00:58:47.876 --> 00:58:49.176
permitting regime

1084
00:58:50.296 --> 00:58:53.996
won't secure the ninety-five percent capture rate

1085
00:58:54.196 --> 00:58:57.456
either, and that's at, page

1086
00:58:57.496 --> 00:59:00.736
forty-five, and it's covered in

1087

00:59:00.836 --> 00:59:04.696
section, D dot two.

1088
00:59:04.736 --> 00:59:07.456
Several paragraphs on that, I think.

1089
00:59:07.536 --> 00:59:11.476
And also that the, the best available

1090
00:59:11.636 --> 00:59:13.896
technique reliance

1091
00:59:15.136 --> 00:59:18.016
and the UK CCSRC

1092
00:59:18.596 --> 00:59:22.476
document, which come onto as this sort of

1093
00:59:22.496 --> 00:59:26.226
mysterious document you can't find, but, but the, the...

1094
00:59:26.256 --> 00:59:29.976
that reliance, also does not

1095
00:59:30.016 --> 00:59:33.476
secure the ninety-five percent capture rate, and that's at page

1096
00:59:33.656 --> 00:59:37.556
forty-six, section D point three.

1097
00:59:37.956 --> 00:59:41.216
Um, nor does the EU ETS

1098
00:59:42.016 --> 00:59:44.976
secure the ninety-five percent capture rate, and, and that's on page

1099
00:59:45.016 --> 00:59:47.306
forty-seven. Um,

1100
00:59:48.476 --> 00:59:48.586
that's-

1101
00:59:48.586 --> 00:59:52.286
Thank you. I'll, I'll just wanna pull it back to the, the, the examination that

1102
00:59:52.296 --> 00:59:54.276
we're doing here on, on the development consent order.

1103
00:59:54.286 --> 00:59:54.286
Yes.

1104
00:59:54.316 --> 00:59:57.746
So there's, there's, there's only so much within the scope of the, the

1105
00:59:57.796 --> 00:59:59.916
Secretary of State within his development consent order-

1106
00:59:59.936 --> 00:59:59.946
Mm-hmm

1107
00:59:59.946 --> 01:00:01.416
... if he chooses to make it or not.

1108
01:00:01.436 --> 01:00:02.956
Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

1109
01:00:02.966 --> 01:00:04.976
Um, the, you know, the environmental permit requirements and all those other

1110
01:00:05.016 --> 01:00:08.016
factors would be, to other legislation.

1111
01:00:08.036 --> 01:00:08.586
Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

1112
01:00:08.596 --> 01:00:12.556
But let's pull it back to... I'm gonna go back to the applicant if I can

1113

01:00:12.596 --> 01:00:15.676
to answer that, but what I'm, what I'm very interested in from my point of view is

1114
01:00:15.716 --> 01:00:15.836
that

1115
01:00:17.036 --> 01:00:20.726
y-you've requested that a, an amendment's been made to the d-draft development

1116
01:00:20.876 --> 01:00:24.376
consent order. You've made an amendment which secures ninety-five

1117
01:00:24.456 --> 01:00:28.436
percent target for design, is what I'm hearing from,

1118
01:00:28.856 --> 01:00:30.196
Dr Boswell. But

1119
01:00:31.036 --> 01:00:33.196
could you perhaps address his concerns that that doesn't

1120
01:00:33.296 --> 01:00:35.480
actuallyum,

1121
01:00:36.620 --> 01:00:40.480
ensure that in its operation, you actually

1122
01:00:40.520 --> 01:00:42.680
achieve that target.

1123
01:00:43.660 --> 01:00:45.540
So Jane, Jane Strong for the applicant.

1124
01:00:45.600 --> 01:00:48.480
I, I, I said I was hoping it could be dealt with shortly.

1125
01:00:48.560 --> 01:00:52.080
Uh, it appears not. But the, in answer to your

1126

01:00:52.160 --> 01:00:54.960
question, the approach that's been followed is

1127
01:00:55.040 --> 01:00:58.300
identical to that which the Secretary of State,

1128
01:00:58.580 --> 01:01:02.560
required of the Net Zero Teesside order twenty twenty-four, the

1129
01:01:02.600 --> 01:01:06.240
KIB three order of twenty twenty-two, and which

1130
01:01:06.500 --> 01:01:08.600
Dr. Boswell himself requested.

1131
01:01:08.620 --> 01:01:08.800
Yeah.

1132
01:01:08.840 --> 01:01:11.250
And, so that's the first point.

1133
01:01:11.300 --> 01:01:13.920
It-- what he's now requesting is different from what

1134
01:01:14.620 --> 01:01:14.840
Yeah.

1135
01:01:14.900 --> 01:01:16.150
Um, leave-- But

1136
01:01:16.960 --> 01:01:20.380
import-- that is an important point, but leave that aside for one moment.

1137
01:01:20.420 --> 01:01:24.140
The reason it's expressed in that way is because that is the appropriate

1138
01:01:24.200 --> 01:01:28.100
way to express it. The design is therefore

1139

01:01:28.120 --> 01:01:31.220
to achieve ninety-five percent. It-- the

1140
01:01:31.680 --> 01:01:35.260
EI-EIA process and the Rochdale envelope should not be

1141
01:01:35.320 --> 01:01:36.620
confused with this

1142
01:01:38.000 --> 01:01:41.900
council of perfection i- of, catering for

1143
01:01:41.960 --> 01:01:45.240
every eventuality that may or may not transpire in reality.

1144
01:01:45.260 --> 01:01:47.760
It's about assessing realistic worst case

1145
01:01:47.900 --> 01:01:51.740
scenarios. In addition, of course, the actual

1146
01:01:51.800 --> 01:01:54.820
operation of the power station once designed, but when it's

1147
01:01:54.900 --> 01:01:58.580
operated, has its own sub additional

1148
01:01:58.660 --> 01:02:01.560
controls, and Dr. Boswell appears is unhappy with those.

1149
01:02:01.580 --> 01:02:05.060
But there, there is the environmental permitting regime

1150
01:02:05.560 --> 01:02:08.940
in addition to the whole question of

1151
01:02:08.980 --> 01:02:12.620
emissions being controlled at a national level to deal with

1152
01:02:12.780 --> 01:02:16.580
national carbon budgets and all sorts of policy levers that the

1153
01:02:16.640 --> 01:02:20.460
Secretary of State can apply as and when power stations and

1154
01:02:20.500 --> 01:02:23.940
many other industry at-- report their actual emissions.

1155
01:02:23.960 --> 01:02:27.760
If they fall below, they-- If they fall below what

1156
01:02:27.780 --> 01:02:30.030
they're required to do, they may breach their permits.

1157
01:02:30.080 --> 01:02:33.140
If even if they're in compliance with their permits, the Secretary of State can

1158
01:02:33.200 --> 01:02:36.380
take a view if emissions are falling below in any

1159
01:02:36.440 --> 01:02:37.580
sector. So

1160
01:02:38.660 --> 01:02:42.100
the notion that this power station should be treated

1161
01:02:42.560 --> 01:02:46.340
differently to any of those, power stations

1162
01:02:46.540 --> 01:02:50.170
for which brackets Dr. Boswell was content because he asked for the

1163
01:02:50.280 --> 01:02:50.540
same-

1164
01:02:50.940 --> 01:02:51.160
Yeah

1165
01:02:51.180 --> 01:02:54.350
... I don't understand, but more importantly, is simply

1166
01:02:54.360 --> 01:02:57.870
not, an, a rational approach here because it's

1167
01:02:57.940 --> 01:03:01.730
not recognizing all of the other limitations that

1168
01:03:01.760 --> 01:03:05.480
apply. And building in a requirement,

1169
01:03:06.060 --> 01:03:09.680
bearing in mind how DCO work, DCO works and criminal sanctions, et

1170
01:03:09.740 --> 01:03:13.300
cetera, in terms of these sorts of emission rates is

1171
01:03:13.360 --> 01:03:17.260
completely inappropriate. What's important is that the

1172
01:03:17.340 --> 01:03:21.320
power station is designed in that way, and so it's designed to

1173
01:03:21.680 --> 01:03:25.480
operate in that way. As to what act-- you know, the actual

1174
01:03:25.560 --> 01:03:28.820
rates that occur in the future, there are me- there are all the
other mechanisms

1175
01:03:28.860 --> 01:03:32.720
to, to control that. I j-- Can I-- Uh, I, I don't want to

1176
01:03:33.060 --> 01:03:33.600
reopen

1177
01:03:34.720 --> 01:03:38.080
the earlier topics, but there is a general point relating to this
and the earlier

1178
01:03:38.160 --> 01:03:41.750
topics, because Dr. Boswell is making

1179
01:03:42.260 --> 01:03:43.000
points about

1180
01:03:44.060 --> 01:03:45.360
the Rochdale envelope,

1181
01:03:46.700 --> 01:03:50.680
realistic worst case, and full knowledge for EIA

1182
01:03:50.780 --> 01:03:54.460
purposes. That is, I would

1183
01:03:54.520 --> 01:03:58.360
respectfully suggest, misunderstanding what the

1184
01:03:58.820 --> 01:04:01.260
Supreme Court and the law

1185
01:04:01.340 --> 01:04:05.260
recognizes. Realistic worst cases

1186
01:04:05.940 --> 01:04:07.540
are realistic.

1187
01:04:07.560 --> 01:04:07.730
Yes.

1188
01:04:07.760 --> 01:04:10.760
They're not the ones that are unrealistic.

1189
01:04:11.160 --> 01:04:14.820
Likely significant effects are those which are likely, not those which

1190
01:04:14.880 --> 01:04:18.520
are unlikely. Bearing in mind that that word has a particular

1191
01:04:18.540 --> 01:04:22.340
connotation in European, but you're not there to cover every

1192

01:04:22.500 --> 01:04:25.430
eventuality and every pessimistic scenario.

1193
01:04:26.280 --> 01:04:30.160
You're dealing with realistic worst case scenarios, and in that respect,

1194
01:04:30.220 --> 01:04:33.960
it's also important to remember what Lord Leggett in the Supreme

1195
01:04:34.060 --> 01:04:37.690
Court said in Finch, when you think about the other

1196
01:04:37.720 --> 01:04:40.260
topics we've just been discussing and this one,

1197
01:04:41.260 --> 01:04:42.040
is-- and, and

1198
01:04:42.840 --> 01:04:46.780
just to be clear, conjecture and speculation have no

1199
01:04:46.920 --> 01:04:49.460
role in the EIA process.

1200
01:04:49.480 --> 01:04:49.590
Mm-hmm.

1201
01:04:49.820 --> 01:04:53.780
And using the Finch judgment on whatever you're looking at, effects

1202
01:04:53.899 --> 01:04:57.680
or assessment, in order to say you, you have to

1203
01:04:57.760 --> 01:05:00.660
cover all the uncertainties in the

1204
01:05:00.700 --> 01:05:04.520
world, all the speculative crystal ball

1205
01:05:04.600 --> 01:05:08.400

gazing to include in an ES, is

1206
01:05:08.420 --> 01:05:12.320
precisely what was not, precisely what Finch was trying to

1207
01:05:12.380 --> 01:05:15.980
avoid. As it happened in that case, there were established

1208
01:05:16.460 --> 01:05:19.720
knowns as to what a, a barrel of oil would

1209
01:05:20.000 --> 01:05:22.220
generate in terms of emissions if you burnt it.

1210
01:05:23.140 --> 01:05:26.980
If you apply that to what we've been discussing, you're automatically

1211
01:05:27.020 --> 01:05:30.500
into the world of speculation, in

1212
01:05:30.540 --> 01:05:34.340
addition to the fact that there is no benchmark for,

1213
01:05:34.380 --> 01:05:37.210
for, for assessing those,

1214
01:05:38.100 --> 01:05:39.940
speculative figures. And

1215
01:05:40.880 --> 01:05:44.680
I, I think you will be assisted in that

1216
01:05:44.740 --> 01:05:48.680
respect by considering the more recent litigation applying

1217
01:05:48.820 --> 01:05:49.240
Finch

1218
01:05:50.140 --> 01:05:53.600
in the aviation sector, where a very similar issue arose.

1219
01:05:53.640 --> 01:05:57.400
How do you deal with non-CO2 emissions generated by aircraft-

1220
01:05:57.580 --> 01:05:57.700
Mm-hmm

1221
01:05:57.880 --> 01:06:01.420
... where there are no carbon budgets for them, and they're very

1222
01:06:01.520 --> 01:06:05.160
difficult to assess, but there's no doubt they occur.

1223
01:06:05.200 --> 01:06:08.960
And the courts most recently have said it's a legitimate thing for the

1224
01:06:09.000 --> 01:06:12.960
Secretary of State applying the Finch process to say,

1225
01:06:12.969 --> 01:06:16.820
"Well, if I haven't got a benchmark, it's not in my carbon budget, I could

1226
01:06:16.940 --> 01:06:20.790
generate a f- notional figure, but what on earth am I gonna do with it, because I

1227
01:06:20.840 --> 01:06:24.240
can't assess its significance to the wider,

1228
01:06:24.540 --> 01:06:28.520
effects on greenhouse gases?" And that's precisely what's happening in

1229
01:06:28.540 --> 01:06:29.700
this discussion here.

1230
01:06:29.720 --> 01:06:29.830
Yeah.

1231

01:06:29.900 --> 01:06:32.940
Apologize, that's a slight digression for what you actually asked me, but I think

1232
01:06:32.980 --> 01:06:36.700
it's important to, to bear that in mind when you're thinking about what

1233
01:06:36.760 --> 01:06:38.140
questions you're going to formulate.

1234
01:06:38.672 --> 01:06:42.662
Thank you. Uh, yes, I-I'm drawing it back to the topic question, but I

1235
01:06:42.692 --> 01:06:46.312
do appreciate, what, what we're, the, the areas we're going off into and the

1236
01:06:46.352 --> 01:06:48.212
points of, conjecture and what have you.

1237
01:06:48.632 --> 01:06:52.432
I'm incredibly, unfortunately to my sins, familiar with reasonable

1238
01:06:52.812 --> 01:06:56.392
worst case scenario prediction and the legislation around

1239
01:06:56.432 --> 01:07:00.402
de-defending that for various, national incidents, and also

1240
01:07:00.432 --> 01:07:03.212
the, the percentile distributions of other ones to be considered within the

1241
01:07:03.232 --> 01:07:07.082
Rochdale envelope. So I, I am happy about what we need to look at and also what is

1242
01:07:07.152 --> 01:07:10.112
reasonable to consider and what is not reasonable.

1243

01:07:10.412 --> 01:07:14.212
I, I, I was specifically looking here about, the

1244
01:07:14.272 --> 01:07:17.992
action of how do we ensure that this plant operates in the way that it is designed.

1245
01:07:18.092 --> 01:07:21.612
I think we've touched on quite a few topics there that are outside of the remit of

1246
01:07:21.632 --> 01:07:25.572
this examination, and, and I'm happy now to move on to item

1247
01:07:25.652 --> 01:07:29.382
four point two, which is the proposed development's potential contribution to

1248
01:07:29.452 --> 01:07:32.842
mitigating for climate effects. So what I'm really looking here is earlier in four

1249
01:07:32.972 --> 01:07:33.572
point one,

1250
01:07:34.452 --> 01:07:35.232
I was looking at

1251
01:07:36.332 --> 01:07:40.292
what effect does this proposed development have on making

1252
01:07:40.352 --> 01:07:44.192
climate change worse. What I'm interested here in four

1253
01:07:44.292 --> 01:07:45.992
point two is, what

1254
01:07:46.972 --> 01:07:50.372
effect could this proposed development have on making climate change

1255
01:07:50.492 --> 01:07:54.472
better, if any? So if I can move to the applicant, please, to, begin

1256
01:07:54.632 --> 01:07:57.412
and just give me your update on that.

1257
01:07:57.452 --> 01:07:59.352
Ben Murray.

1258
01:08:01.392 --> 01:08:03.652
For the applicant. Yes, sir. Thank you.

1259
01:08:03.692 --> 01:08:06.552
As we've already alluded to, the role of this

1260
01:08:07.232 --> 01:08:11.172
installation is to provide low carbon dispatchable power

1261
01:08:11.252 --> 01:08:14.572
in s- in support of the, the national grid to maintain

1262
01:08:15.612 --> 01:08:18.112
a, a resilient power supply.

1263
01:08:18.213 --> 01:08:21.522
Um, in that capacity, as we've already

1264
01:08:21.692 --> 01:08:25.472
mentioned, our contention is that it will explicitly

1265
01:08:25.482 --> 01:08:28.222
displace a higher carbon unabated

1266
01:08:28.413 --> 01:08:31.742
gas-fired combined cycle gas turbine that is

1267
01:08:31.793 --> 01:08:35.772
currently serving that same purpose in maintaining

1268
01:08:36.152 --> 01:08:39.432
the s- accurate supply in the national grid.

1269

01:08:39.492 --> 01:08:42.992
So by virtue of the lower scope one

1270
01:08:43.052 --> 01:08:46.713
emissions, irrespective of what's happening upstream, scope

1271
01:08:46.753 --> 01:08:49.452
three, which as we've noted applies equally to-

1272
01:08:49.492 --> 01:08:49.652
Yeah

1273
01:08:49.663 --> 01:08:53.512
... all users of natural gas, the

1274
01:08:53.552 --> 01:08:54.392
carbon capture plant

1275
01:08:55.432 --> 01:08:59.293
guarantees that this has a lower scope one

1276
01:08:59.373 --> 01:09:02.992
emissions than the existing unabated plant that we contend it

1277
01:09:03.032 --> 01:09:06.432
will displace by virtue of being earlier in the merit

1278
01:09:06.492 --> 01:09:08.413
order.

1279
01:09:08.472 --> 01:09:10.913
Thank you. Yeah, so just again, in my head so I understand

1280
01:09:12.293 --> 01:09:14.932
part upstream emissions now, we're saying

1281
01:09:15.172 --> 01:09:18.532
that, or, or you're contesting that

1282
01:09:22.352 --> 01:09:26.272
when someone decides they want to sp- switch on some dispatchable

power, the

1283
01:09:26.312 --> 01:09:29.512
priority will go to your site over an u-unabated site because it is

1284
01:09:29.552 --> 01:09:33.472
abated, and therefore, whilst you will

1285
01:09:33.532 --> 01:09:37.512
still be emitting, you'll be emitting less than a comparable site

1286
01:09:38.272 --> 01:09:42.213
of gas fired. Um, I just wanted to just

1287
01:09:42.293 --> 01:09:46.253
double-check. I understand that you could make an argument, "Well, that's

1288
01:09:46.272 --> 01:09:49.861
not as good as a solar farm or as good as a nuclear power station." I, I, I don't

1289
01:09:49.892 --> 01:09:52.972
want to go down that route. I'm happy that I understand that that's could always be

1290
01:09:53.132 --> 01:09:53.492
argued.

1291
01:09:55.092 --> 01:09:59.032
I wanted to check if there is any other benefit I am missing

1292
01:09:59.072 --> 01:10:02.712
that this plant could offer. So, is there some

1293
01:10:02.772 --> 01:10:06.712
way that, you know, are you act- you're not taking carbon dioxide out

1294
01:10:06.732 --> 01:10:09.252
of the atmosphere and scrubbing it for others. You're not doing anything like that.

1295
01:10:09.272 --> 01:10:13.232
There's nothing I'm missing here that it, it also mitigates for

1296
01:10:13.272 --> 01:10:15.532
the wider climate change international

1297
01:10:15.572 --> 01:10:18.012
effects.

1298
01:10:19.172 --> 01:10:23.112
It's just less smoky than a, an, an older plant, if

1299
01:10:23.132 --> 01:10:23.852
that makes sense.

1300
01:10:24.852 --> 01:10:26.112
Sorry to put it simply, but-

1301
01:10:27.052 --> 01:10:28.712
Ja-James Strong for the applicant.

1302
01:10:28.772 --> 01:10:32.332
I, I don't know whether th-this comes within your category

1303
01:10:33.132 --> 01:10:34.361
of,

1304
01:10:36.812 --> 01:10:40.532
what you're considering, but by virtue of being

1305
01:10:40.572 --> 01:10:43.072
a, a dispatchable power station,

1306
01:10:44.412 --> 01:10:48.392
it-- we are facilitating the shift to low carbon

1307
01:10:48.532 --> 01:10:49.052
usage

1308

01:10:50.252 --> 01:10:53.252
in the wider population because

1309
01:10:54.392 --> 01:10:56.892
renewables, for example, cannot

1310
01:10:57.572 --> 01:11:00.692
accommodate, by virtue of their nature, every power

1311
01:11:00.772 --> 01:11:03.972
event. I'm using the wrong tech-logical term.

1312
01:11:04.012 --> 01:11:04.432
That's okay.

1313
01:11:04.472 --> 01:11:08.312
So i- and that's of course recognized in policy,

1314
01:11:08.392 --> 01:11:10.312
but it is a benefit nonetheless-

1315
01:11:10.332 --> 01:11:10.751
Yeah

1316
01:11:10.762 --> 01:11:14.012
... because it enables users or consumers or

1317
01:11:14.052 --> 01:11:17.972
indeed, anyone taking this power to become

1318
01:11:18.552 --> 01:11:21.872
low carbon and to therefore benefit climate change.

1319
01:11:21.912 --> 01:11:25.542
So that is a s- a separate but a, a

1320
01:11:25.542 --> 01:11:29.202
additional climate change benefit of dispatchable

1321
01:11:29.312 --> 01:11:29.992
power.

1322
01:11:30.052 --> 01:11:32.692
Thank you. So that's the bit, that's exactly the sort of direction I was just

1323
01:11:32.712 --> 01:11:35.532
trying to see. Is there any benefits that I'm missing of this project

1324
01:11:36.152 --> 01:11:39.832
that, that we haven't alluded to? And I think what, again, trying to summarize it

1325
01:11:39.852 --> 01:11:43.052
in my head very simply again, what you're saying is that we

1326
01:11:43.092 --> 01:11:46.542
have... The, the country is moving

1327
01:11:46.992 --> 01:11:50.522
or trying to move to a lower carbon technology power

1328
01:11:50.632 --> 01:11:53.842
production system. Some of that, solar, wind,

1329
01:11:54.872 --> 01:11:57.512
has not the ability to take the peaks and troughs.

1330
01:11:57.532 --> 01:12:01.412
By the construction of this proposed development, you'll be able to smooth

1331
01:12:01.492 --> 01:12:05.422
out those troughs and help make the other

1332
01:12:05.452 --> 01:12:08.712
stuff ha-happen as well, simplistically.

1333
01:12:08.732 --> 01:12:12.592
If, if it wasn't for you being able to fill in the blanks, they might not be

1334
01:12:12.612 --> 01:12:14.132
able to happen.

1335
01:12:14.232 --> 01:12:17.252
Ye- y-yes. Uh, it's James Strong for the applicant.

1336
01:12:17.632 --> 01:12:20.372
In, in short, yes. Uh, the, the, the

1337
01:12:20.532 --> 01:12:24.192
shift to, a low

1338
01:12:24.352 --> 01:12:24.852
carbon

1339
01:12:25.772 --> 01:12:29.632
en-environment necessarily calls for greater

1340
01:12:29.712 --> 01:12:33.672
electricity reliance and, but within that,

1341
01:12:33.712 --> 01:12:37.432
the demand for electricity and the peaks and troughs you

1342
01:12:37.492 --> 01:12:40.572
are, you're identifying become more problematic.

1343
01:12:40.592 --> 01:12:40.812
Yeah.

1344
01:12:40.852 --> 01:12:44.372
And so dispatchable power offers that ability

1345
01:12:44.736 --> 01:12:48.516
Necessary ability to deal with what, for example, renewables will be

1346
01:12:48.576 --> 01:12:51.966
unable to do as the demand for

1347
01:12:51.996 --> 01:12:55.516

electricity increases because of its low

1348
01:12:55.596 --> 01:12:58.686
carbon nature. Um,

1349
01:13:00.516 --> 01:13:02.716
thank you. That's great. Thank you. Um, Dr.

1350
01:13:02.756 --> 01:13:04.976
Boswell, I know you want to come in on item four point two.

1351
01:13:04.996 --> 01:13:08.816
Would you like to, raise your point now, please?

1352
01:13:09.756 --> 01:13:13.036
Yes. Dr. Andrew Boswell, Climate Emergency Science

1353
01:13:13.216 --> 01:13:14.956
Law. Um,

1354
01:13:16.396 --> 01:13:18.096
first of all,

1355
01:13:20.516 --> 01:13:22.696
let's say the, the,

1356
01:13:22.776 --> 01:13:26.536
um... What the applicant is

1357
01:13:26.576 --> 01:13:27.836
talking about

1358
01:13:28.796 --> 01:13:32.756
is, is effectively plate twenty-two,

1359
01:13:33.776 --> 01:13:36.836
which I think is on somewhere like page thirty-one, thirty-two of

1360
01:13:36.896 --> 01:13:40.196
the chapter twenty. Now,

1361
01:13:41.396 --> 01:13:43.976
when you actually apply

1362
01:13:45.136 --> 01:13:49.076
the uncertainties we've been talking about to the data in that

1363
01:13:49.175 --> 01:13:49.696
chart,

1364
01:13:50.536 --> 01:13:53.635
what you actually get is, is much smaller

1365
01:13:53.696 --> 01:13:57.476
gains f-of the abated

1366
01:13:58.016 --> 01:14:01.566
CCS system over the unabated. Um,

1367
01:14:02.756 --> 01:14:06.016
just to give you an i-idea of

1368
01:14:06.136 --> 01:14:08.076
that, um-

1369
01:14:08.116 --> 01:14:09.676
Sorry, can I just ask, just follow up on that?

1370
01:14:09.696 --> 01:14:12.216
We, we, we just had a discussion a moment ago where you were saying
you're trying

1371
01:14:12.256 --> 01:14:16.036
to secure the ninety-five percent operation of the abated plant.

1372
01:14:16.076 --> 01:14:19.436
You're now suggesting that potentially they don't need to run abated

1373
01:14:20.356 --> 01:14:22.326
to get the same... I, I, I think we need to...

1374

01:14:22.356 --> 01:14:25.996
I, I'm very clearly asking a question here about can you define to

1375
01:14:26.056 --> 01:14:29.816
me, do you have an opinion on whether this plant

1376
01:14:30.816 --> 01:14:33.976
will have a wider mitigating impact on climate change?

1377
01:14:34.036 --> 01:14:35.456
I d- I don't want to go into the detail again.

1378
01:14:35.476 --> 01:14:36.106
I'm, I'm happy to-

1379
01:14:36.116 --> 01:14:36.126
Yeah

1380
01:14:36.126 --> 01:14:39.856
... do that outside of this hearing, which is a, a, a, a vocal, you know,

1381
01:14:39.916 --> 01:14:40.296
hearing.

1382
01:14:40.316 --> 01:14:40.676
Mm-hmm.

1383
01:14:40.756 --> 01:14:42.576
But if you can highlight to me that you think

1384
01:14:43.376 --> 01:14:46.756
it does or it doesn't, that would be very useful.

1385
01:14:47.556 --> 01:14:48.936
Um,

1386
01:14:51.256 --> 01:14:52.855
I f-

1387
01:14:53.956 --> 01:14:57.425

I, I th- I, I can reply to that. Um,

1388
01:14:58.376 --> 01:15:02.016
I think it's best to reply to it because I think we're getting out into sort of

1389
01:15:02.076 --> 01:15:05.916
policy areas. And I have tried to, in everything I've

1390
01:15:05.976 --> 01:15:09.425
submitted, stay absolutely close to the environmental

1391
01:15:09.496 --> 01:15:10.765
impact assessment

1392
01:15:11.576 --> 01:15:14.265
and what's in-involved for that, because that's

1393
01:15:14.396 --> 01:15:17.876
essentially, what I'm, what I'm

1394
01:15:17.936 --> 01:15:21.516
a-addressing in, in the chapter twenty, and I believe what the chapter

1395
01:15:21.616 --> 01:15:24.856
twenty is. So, you know,

1396
01:15:26.306 --> 01:15:29.396
I would raise issues like, you know, this is a thirty-year

1397
01:15:29.536 --> 01:15:33.106
project, and it's, locking in

1398
01:15:33.176 --> 01:15:36.676
longer, you know, fossil fuel-based

1399
01:15:36.756 --> 01:15:39.496
systems for longer than is necessary.

1400
01:15:39.516 --> 01:15:43.316

But, you know, all these are very, qualitative

1401
01:15:43.476 --> 01:15:46.536
arguments, and they're sort of policy type arguments.

1402
01:15:46.546 --> 01:15:49.796
I, I'm happy to engage in that, but I don't think it's the

1403
01:15:49.896 --> 01:15:52.756
issue here in front of the

1404
01:15:52.796 --> 01:15:56.596
examination. If, if you, if, if you don't mind me saying that

1405
01:15:56.636 --> 01:15:57.866
respectfully, sir.

1406
01:15:57.876 --> 01:15:59.696
Yeah, no, no. Okay. Understand. So-

1407
01:15:59.716 --> 01:16:03.076
Um, and what I would like to carry on actually and say that the,

1408
01:16:03.116 --> 01:16:06.716
the, the, um... What the applicant said about the

1409
01:16:06.776 --> 01:16:09.876
plate twenty, dash two

1410
01:16:10.796 --> 01:16:14.555
is the, the purpose of it is, and I'm reading actually verbatim
from,

1411
01:16:15.896 --> 01:16:18.356
the, the app- the, the APP 0

1412
01:16:18.416 --> 01:16:22.076
fifty-eight, the, the climate change chapter twenty

1413
01:16:22.536 --> 01:16:26.176
at twenty point six forty-two, says to

1414
01:16:26.256 --> 01:16:30.176
quantify and contextualize the net benefit of the proposed

1415
01:16:30.196 --> 01:16:33.956
development. So that's what we're, we're talking about, wh-whether there's a net

1416
01:16:33.996 --> 01:16:37.736
benefit or not. And, the, the operational carbon

1417
01:16:37.796 --> 01:16:41.076
intensity value has been calculated and compared to the carbon

1418
01:16:41.136 --> 01:16:44.116
intensity over existing unabated

1419
01:16:44.176 --> 01:16:47.736
CCGT and the UK, grid

1420
01:16:47.816 --> 01:16:51.456
average. Now, I'll submit further information on this.

1421
01:16:51.476 --> 01:16:54.316
And as I say, my-- once you apply the

1422
01:16:54.356 --> 01:16:58.296
uncertainties, the numbers are different to what the applicant's

1423
01:16:58.336 --> 01:17:01.256
getting i-in, in a disfavorable way.

1424
01:17:01.296 --> 01:17:04.396
But what I wanted to point out about this

1425
01:17:04.476 --> 01:17:08.416
exercise in itself, and

1426
01:17:08.476 --> 01:17:11.956
if I may re-refer you to the Net Zero Teesside

1427
01:17:11.996 --> 01:17:15.616
decision letter, and that's Rep one 0

1428
01:17:15.656 --> 01:17:18.736
seventy-nine. I submitted it as an

1429
01:17:18.776 --> 01:17:22.196
appendix, at, at deadline one.

1430
01:17:22.296 --> 01:17:26.256
Um, on page fifteen, and it's

1431
01:17:26.296 --> 01:17:30.136
paragraph four point three five. Now, I f- I, I'll

1432
01:17:30.176 --> 01:17:33.276
read it in, in entirety if I may. Um-

1433
01:17:33.296 --> 01:17:35.446
No, that's fine. I, I can read that later because that's-

1434
01:17:35.456 --> 01:17:35.586
Okay

1435
01:17:35.676 --> 01:17:37.876
... that's exactly the point. The point of this, this hearing is very much for it

1436
01:17:37.916 --> 01:17:40.576
to be vocal and have a discussion. It-- I, I will pick that up later-

1437
01:17:40.586 --> 01:17:40.586
Okay

1438
01:17:40.586 --> 01:17:41.476
... and read that. I can assure you.

1439
01:17:41.496 --> 01:17:44.256
Well, what I... Can I just summarize what that says?

1440
01:17:44.316 --> 01:17:44.836
It says-

1441
01:17:44.856 --> 01:17:45.156
Please do

1442
01:17:45.476 --> 01:17:49.316
... o-on a similar exercise being carried out for the Net Zero

1443
01:17:49.456 --> 01:17:51.766
Teesside application,

1444
01:17:52.816 --> 01:17:56.496
that, the, the, the, the examining

1445
01:17:56.536 --> 01:17:57.336
authority

1446
01:17:58.136 --> 01:18:01.536
said, that they did not consider it viable

1447
01:18:02.136 --> 01:18:05.696
to use unmitigated emissions as a baseline any

1448
01:18:05.756 --> 01:18:09.696
longer. And that, that, then the Secretary

1449
01:18:09.736 --> 01:18:13.576
of State agreed, noting that the proposed development

1450
01:18:13.586 --> 01:18:17.346
would, in that case, would emit approximately twenty megatons of

1451
01:18:17.436 --> 01:18:21.346
CO2 during its operational life. The environmental statement on this one is

1452
01:18:21.376 --> 01:18:22.506
saying forty-two-

1453

01:18:22.696 --> 01:18:26.256
I, I'm sorry. I think we are going back to the original point about emissions

1454
01:18:26.556 --> 01:18:27.356
and, and

1455
01:18:29.396 --> 01:18:33.296
its contribution towards worsening climate change, and we, and we're not on

1456
01:18:33.356 --> 01:18:36.096
that item anymore. I'm looking at can you help me

1457
01:18:37.136 --> 01:18:39.796
identify any way in which this project

1458
01:18:41.116 --> 01:18:44.316
helps reduce the risks of future climate change?

1459
01:18:44.326 --> 01:18:47.406
And I think it, it's simply I'm just trying to understand if I missed something.

1460
01:18:47.616 --> 01:18:51.416
I, I, I completely get that you think that some of the assumptions about the carbon

1461
01:18:51.476 --> 01:18:55.356
use and intensity of the site may have been underestimated by the applicant or not.

1462
01:18:55.376 --> 01:18:55.616
Mm-hmm.

1463
01:18:55.636 --> 01:18:58.456
And I, I appreciate, and again, looking at, you know, the plates you're referring

1464
01:18:58.576 --> 01:19:02.172
me to, theIt's unreasonable to use

1465

01:19:02.752 --> 01:19:05.672
unmitigated, emission sites and all that.

1466
01:19:05.692 --> 01:19:09.482
But I, I'm actually really interested in four point two on, is there anything this

1467
01:19:09.532 --> 01:19:09.872
site

1468
01:19:10.792 --> 01:19:12.212
proposed development does

1469
01:19:13.332 --> 01:19:16.932
to reduce the risk of future climate change? If, if the answer's no, that's fine.

1470
01:19:16.972 --> 01:19:17.712
Or if there's actually-

1471
01:19:17.732 --> 01:19:18.382
Yes, yes

1472
01:19:18.432 --> 01:19:19.462
... it's, it's, it's these other things. That's, that's my experience.

1473
01:19:19.462 --> 01:19:22.252
No, no, my opinion is, so it's,

1474
01:19:23.392 --> 01:19:25.752
Dr. Andrew Boswell, Climate Change Science Law.

1475
01:19:25.792 --> 01:19:26.052
My

1476
01:19:26.992 --> 01:19:30.862
answer is that taken in the round and looking

1477
01:19:30.892 --> 01:19:34.772
at many, many factors, you know, which I have done, you know, for, for

1478
01:19:35.052 --> 01:19:38.732
many years actually, no. No.

1479
01:19:38.792 --> 01:19:39.112
Okay.

1480
01:19:39.121 --> 01:19:42.972
I- I- it, it is not a benefit in the current situation to

1481
01:19:43.012 --> 01:19:46.702
progress down the route of fossil fuel-based carbon capture and

1482
01:19:46.752 --> 01:19:50.492
storage, and I do distinguish that from other uses

1483
01:19:50.632 --> 01:19:54.492
of carbon capture and storage. But fossil fuel carbon

1484
01:19:54.572 --> 01:19:57.432
capture and storage, I do not personally think

1485
01:19:57.972 --> 01:20:01.782
bring benefits in tackling climate change at this

1486
01:20:01.812 --> 01:20:03.372
moment in time.

1487
01:20:03.392 --> 01:20:04.422
Thank you. That's, that's, that's actually done.

1488
01:20:04.422 --> 01:20:06.042
So that's a shame to end on that. But can I just-

1489
01:20:06.152 --> 01:20:06.502
Yeah. Thank you for that

1490
01:20:06.502 --> 01:20:10.312
... cover what I was saying, 'cause I think it's an important point on this

1491
01:20:10.372 --> 01:20:14.112
exercise that's been, that, that's been carried out sort of

1492
01:20:14.692 --> 01:20:18.292
to demonstrate some net gain by the

1493
01:20:18.372 --> 01:20:21.972
applicant. That in the Net Zero Teesside one, the

1494
01:20:22.032 --> 01:20:24.832
Secretary of State didn't accept-

1495
01:20:25.252 --> 01:20:25.352
Yeah

1496
01:20:25.372 --> 01:20:28.892
... that as a, a, a, as a, an appropriate comparator

1497
01:20:29.592 --> 01:20:32.552
and didn't accept it as an appropriate baseline.

1498
01:20:33.052 --> 01:20:34.952
So I'm saying there is a precedent

1499
01:20:35.752 --> 01:20:39.552
that this whole thing we're talking about-

1500
01:20:39.572 --> 01:20:39.622
Yeah

1501
01:20:39.672 --> 01:20:43.572
... the comparison of abated to unabated,

1502
01:20:43.672 --> 01:20:47.572
actually i- i- is not viable. Was-- Is, is

1503
01:20:47.592 --> 01:20:51.572
not valid i- in the EIA discussion, and that's the point I wanted to make.

1504

01:20:51.582 --> 01:20:52.182
And I think it is an important point.

1505
01:20:52.192 --> 01:20:54.152
No, I appreciate it. And I, I apologize.

1506
01:20:54.172 --> 01:20:56.932
I hadn't actually picked that up in your correspondence to me as well, and I do

1507
01:20:56.992 --> 01:21:00.812
note that, and I do note the Secretary of State's opinion on, like I

1508
01:21:00.852 --> 01:21:03.422
said, the Net Zero Teesside, decision.

1509
01:21:03.472 --> 01:21:06.362
All I would say, I'm just gonna give the applicant a, a right to reply if that's

1510
01:21:06.412 --> 01:21:09.952
okay in a moment. But all I would say is, again,

1511
01:21:09.992 --> 01:21:12.692
simplistically to me, and I appreciate what you're saying, that

1512
01:21:14.212 --> 01:21:14.892
it's not

1513
01:21:16.072 --> 01:21:19.832
you, you and the evidence that you provide consider this is not

1514
01:21:19.912 --> 01:21:23.612
reasonable to compare to a traditional plant and its

1515
01:21:23.652 --> 01:21:26.452
emissions and output that has been unabated.

1516
01:21:27.552 --> 01:21:31.092
This is quite a u- good situation. Next door to the proposed

1517

01:21:31.112 --> 01:21:35.072
development is an existing power station.

1518
01:21:35.192 --> 01:21:39.012
I would have thought that provides the most appropriate comparison in

1519
01:21:39.052 --> 01:21:42.782
this particular instance. I will obviously be writing to the

1520
01:21:42.832 --> 01:21:45.172
Secretary of State, and we will have that discussion.

1521
01:21:45.192 --> 01:21:48.992
But I take on board the evidence you provided to me and, and your views on that.

1522
01:21:49.432 --> 01:21:51.072
Would the applicant like to come back on any of those

1523
01:21:51.092 --> 01:21:54.652
points?

1524
01:21:54.792 --> 01:21:56.332
Ben Murray,

1525
01:21:57.412 --> 01:22:01.172
for the applicant. Yes, sir. Um, in relation to the

1526
01:22:01.212 --> 01:22:05.152
Net Zero Teesside letter that Dr. Boswell mentions, my

1527
01:22:05.192 --> 01:22:09.152
understanding is that the Secretary of State was making the point

1528
01:22:09.212 --> 01:22:09.432
that

1529
01:22:10.572 --> 01:22:14.472
an unabated power station was-- could not be offered instead of-

1530

01:22:14.512 --> 01:22:14.652
Yeah

1531
01:22:14.752 --> 01:22:17.912
... the abated one, and that's not the argument that was being made in the

1532
01:22:17.952 --> 01:22:21.232
environmental statement. You know, it is simply an

1533
01:22:21.572 --> 01:22:25.352
uncontrovertible reality that at the moment, unabated gas does

1534
01:22:25.372 --> 01:22:29.312
provide marginal generating capacity, and if unabated gas is

1535
01:22:29.352 --> 01:22:30.652
available, it will,

1536
01:22:31.712 --> 01:22:34.092
displace it in, in the merit

1537
01:22:34.132 --> 01:22:36.672
order.

1538
01:22:37.352 --> 01:22:40.672
Thank you. So again, just for me to summarize before I move on, it's

1539
01:22:40.732 --> 01:22:41.892
just, it's

1540
01:22:42.752 --> 01:22:46.632
not as bad, but not perfect, I think is probably my

1541
01:22:46.952 --> 01:22:50.642
summary of that situation. Um, I'm going to close that item now if that's okay,

1542
01:22:50.652 --> 01:22:53.472
'cause like I said, that was purely for me looking at have I missed something that

1543
01:22:53.812 --> 01:22:56.992
is better. Um, Dr. Boswell, I just wanted to pick up.

1544
01:22:57.012 --> 01:22:59.252
Thank you again for all your evidence. I have, I've read it.

1545
01:22:59.292 --> 01:23:02.932
I will be reading it again and again, I think, to get my head around it completely.

1546
01:23:03.012 --> 01:23:03.202
Um,

1547
01:23:04.332 --> 01:23:07.532
I do also note your correspondence that you won't be able to reply at the next

1548
01:23:07.572 --> 01:23:10.412
deadline and acknowledge that and accept that and that, that you'll be hopefully

1549
01:23:10.432 --> 01:23:13.492
trying to get your reply in by deadline five, so thank you for that.

1550
01:23:13.572 --> 01:23:16.511
Um, I-- Can I just review where we are today?

1551
01:23:16.532 --> 01:23:18.742
So I think thank you again for all the-

1552
01:23:18.742 --> 01:23:19.891
Excuse me, sir.

1553
01:23:19.912 --> 01:23:20.182
Yes.

1554
01:23:20.182 --> 01:23:23.602
Uh, can I just, sort of no-notify you really of, of,

1555
01:23:24.312 --> 01:23:27.062
two things? Yeah, I mean, obviously I'll, I'll put in everything

I've said

1556
01:23:27.092 --> 01:23:30.112
today in a submission, and that would be, as you said, for deadline

1557
01:23:30.212 --> 01:23:33.992
five. I also, have a, a, a legal

1558
01:23:34.112 --> 01:23:37.832
submission to make, which, I myself has

1559
01:23:37.892 --> 01:23:41.532
not, have not drawn up. It's been drawn up by lawyers.

1560
01:23:41.632 --> 01:23:45.492
Um, and for the purposes of fairness,

1561
01:23:45.752 --> 01:23:48.652
well, I wo- I wo- wish to put this to you actually, really how you'd like to

1562
01:23:48.692 --> 01:23:51.472
receive it. But I, I mean, I could wait till March the

1563
01:23:52.132 --> 01:23:56.112
31st for deadline four. I'll actually be away

1564
01:23:56.172 --> 01:23:58.412
then, but I, but submit it for then.

1565
01:23:58.452 --> 01:24:01.982
Or for the purposes of fairness, I actually think it would be,

1566
01:24:02.912 --> 01:24:05.372
best for me to submit it as soon as

1567
01:24:05.432 --> 01:24:09.332
is, i- is possible, which, you know, I, I,

1568
01:24:09.412 --> 01:24:11.812
I, I think might be within about a week.

1569
01:24:11.972 --> 01:24:15.832
Um, and I just wanted to put that to you, and I th- you know, that I think it would

1570
01:24:15.872 --> 01:24:18.732
be fair to the, applicants,

1571
01:24:19.492 --> 01:24:23.372
to, to see that, a- as well, as soon as

1572
01:24:23.412 --> 01:24:24.902
possible. So I just wondered-

1573
01:24:25.012 --> 01:24:25.272
Okay. Thank you

1574
01:24:25.392 --> 01:24:27.172
... if you could ask both of you on that.

1575
01:24:27.182 --> 01:24:28.182
So, we, we obviously have the deadlines.

1576
01:24:28.212 --> 01:24:30.502
I'm just gonna go back to the applicant and see what their opinion is on that.

1577
01:24:30.532 --> 01:24:33.192
I'm probably sure they would say the sooner, sooner they can see it is probably

1578
01:24:33.212 --> 01:24:37.032
better. I would probably, rather than waiting for it to be published

1579
01:24:37.072 --> 01:24:40.832
for, in fairness for all parties to see, excuse me, to see it, I'll probably

1580
01:24:41.952 --> 01:24:45.332
log it under an additional submission, which is gonna upset my colleague at the

1581
01:24:45.352 --> 01:24:49.012
back of the room no doubt. But, we will take it as a, a

1582
01:24:49.052 --> 01:24:52.812
submission prior to a deadline and, and, and but just let me just check with

1583
01:24:52.832 --> 01:24:55.772
Mr. Strachan to see if there is, any view there.

1584
01:24:57.160 --> 01:25:00.880
James Strong for the applicant. Yeah, well, as to the principle, yes,

1585
01:25:01.300 --> 01:25:05.280
the earlier the better, and, I'm pleased to

1586
01:25:05.600 --> 01:25:09.400
provide it. It, it-- and, and in that respect, if it's, if

1587
01:25:09.480 --> 01:25:13.120
it's of that nature, then Dr. Boswell can send it directly to us as well

1588
01:25:13.540 --> 01:25:15.800
if, if, if he so chooses.

1589
01:25:15.810 --> 01:25:16.070
Thank you.

1590
01:25:16.160 --> 01:25:19.520
Um, I, I know... I, I mean, it could still be a deadline submission because

1591
01:25:19.620 --> 01:25:23.160
deadlines are just the latest at which you have to submit.

1592
01:25:23.200 --> 01:25:26.260
You can s- theoretically, I know no one does it, but-

1593
01:25:26.300 --> 01:25:26.490

Yeah.

1594
01:25:26.490 --> 01:25:30.440
...submit submissions any time up to that point, and it could be called a

1595
01:25:30.520 --> 01:25:32.330
deadline for submission being submitted early.

1596
01:25:32.380 --> 01:25:36.360
Okay. I'll, I'll, I'll defer to my colleague, see how he'd

1597
01:25:36.410 --> 01:25:39.040
like to handle that receipt. Um, thank you, Dr.

1598
01:25:39.060 --> 01:25:42.400
Boswell, and like I say, thank you again for notifying us of, your absence,

1599
01:25:43.020 --> 01:25:45.600
prior to, during deadline four. Thank you.

1600
01:25:46.900 --> 01:25:47.210
Um,

1601
01:25:48.280 --> 01:25:51.740
thank you. I was gonna just say thank you again for all the support today and the

1602
01:25:51.780 --> 01:25:55.660
review of the actions. Uh, thank you again for your input from the rear of the room

1603
01:25:55.780 --> 01:25:58.900
this morning. That's been very helpful in the landscape and the visual aspects.

1604
01:25:58.980 --> 01:26:02.420
I, I haven't been and visited all of the viewpoints

1605
01:26:02.620 --> 01:26:06.240
yet. Um, I'm going to continue to do so, and the

1606
01:26:06.280 --> 01:26:10.080
additional ones that, that have been highlighted to me,

1607
01:26:10.120 --> 01:26:12.300
including Open Up Farm. Um,

1608
01:26:13.320 --> 01:26:15.720
before I move off on that, is, is there any other business in the room?

1609
01:26:15.730 --> 01:26:18.260
I'm conscious that I've not come to Flintshire at all, and I'm, I'm seeing you

1610
01:26:18.520 --> 01:26:20.090
nodding at me going, "I'd like to intervene," but if...

1611
01:26:20.100 --> 01:26:23.800
Is anybody either in the room or online who'd like to add any additional

1612
01:26:23.880 --> 01:26:27.790
comments, on these topics of landscape, visual amenity, and

1613
01:26:27.840 --> 01:26:31.740
climate change today? No? Okay. Thank you

1614
01:26:31.800 --> 01:26:33.940
again. Thank you for the value input. Thank you, Dr.

1615
01:26:33.960 --> 01:26:37.460
Boswell, for the considerable amount of evidence you've submitted and also your

1616
01:26:37.640 --> 01:26:40.060
support today and at previous hearings.

1617
01:26:40.160 --> 01:26:40.500
Um-

1618

01:26:41.740 --> 01:26:42.370
Thank you, sir.

1619
01:26:42.370 --> 01:26:46.230
Thank you. Um, I think that concludes the business of this f- fourth issue-specific

1620
01:26:46.260 --> 01:26:49.660
hearing. Thank you for, for joining us, and thank you for all the support from all

1621
01:26:49.680 --> 01:26:53.340
your teams. I do appreciate that. Um, I'll close this hearing now and look forward

1622
01:26:53.380 --> 01:26:56.280
to seeing some of you maybe here this afternoon regarding the compulsory

1623
01:26:56.420 --> 01:27:00.340
acquisition hearing, which commences at, fourteen hundred hours,

1624
01:27:00.360 --> 01:27:04.350
two clock. Uh, this hearing is now closed at thirteen oh four

1625
01:27:04.440 --> 01:27:07.280
hours. Deal. Thank you very much.