

1. Qualifications and Experience

My name is Agnes Mc Laverty, and I am an Environmental Adviser for the Corrib Project. I hold a degree of sivilingeniør (MSc equivalent) in chemical engineering from NTNU, the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim, Norway.

I have worked in the oil and gas industry for over 30 years. My experience includes working in Norway as a process engineer in the design of oil and gas processing systems for offshore platforms, and carrying out conceptual studies and feasibility studies for development of oil and gas fields. In the UK I have worked in teams appraising and acquiring oil and gas exploration acreage, and in Ireland I have worked as a project engineer in a gas production operation (Kinsale Head gas field). During my time with Marathon Petroleum in Cork I spent five years as their senior environmental and safety adviser, covering the Kinsale Head gas field (offshore) and Inch gas terminal.

2. Role in the Corrib Project

I joined the Corrib project in March 2000 as a health, safety and environmental co-ordinator. My role in the project initially on behalf of Enterprise Energy Ireland Ltd, and later Shell E&P Ireland Limited, was to coordinate the environmental impact assessment activities for all aspects of the development. My role has also been to ensure that the commitments made in the application and assessment phases of the project are implemented by the project organisation. That forms the basis of my participation as a representative on the Environmental Monitoring Group established by the Minister for Communications, Marine and Natural Resources in compliance with the conditions of the various consents granted for the development of the Corrib field and associated pipelines in 2002. I am also a representative on the Project Monitoring Committee established by Mayo County Council in accordance with the conditions of the planning permission granted in October 2004 for the development of Bellanaboy Bridge gas terminal and the associated peat deposition site at Srahmore.

3. Contents

My statement deals with the topic of cumulative impacts and impact interactions. It describes the Cumulative Impact Assessments that have been carried out in the course of the Corrib project development, regardless of the separation of the overall project into various elements as required by the various consents processes. These assessments have employed best practice in the identification and assessment of potential impacts.

Unless otherwise noted, the references which I will be making in this statement to the Onshore Pipeline EIS all refer to Environmental Impact Statement, Volume 1 of 3, 'Non-Technical Summary and Environmental Impact Statement', RPS, February 2009.

I will also briefly discuss the landfall site in the context of the offshore pipelay.

Finally I will comment on some of the Conditions which are suggested as being appropriate by Mayo County Council (in their written submission to the Board) in the event that Approval is granted for the proposed development.

4. Corrib Development – Statutory Applications and Associated Environmental Impact Statements

The overall Corrib development project is required to be approved by means of a series of applications as described in the Statement on Planning and Development Policy Context (hereinafter referred to as the Planning Statement). This is not the same as a deliberate splitting of a large project, particularly one that would otherwise exceed a threshold of development that would require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement, into a number of constituent parts each of which in itself would not exceed this threshold. In fact, it is important to note that an Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared to cover every element of the overall project.

For clarity, and in keeping with previous Statements, I have divided the overall Corrib Gas Field Development into 5 elements as follows:

| Elements of the Corrib Gas Field Development | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Offshore installation (subsea wells, wellheads and manifold in the Gas Field). |
| 2 | Offshore pipeline (between wellheads and landfall). |
| 3 | Onshore pipeline (between landfall and the gas terminal). |
| 4 | Bellanaboy Bridge Gas Terminal and associated peat deposition site at Srahmore. |
| 5 | Onshore 150km Mayo to Galway Gas Pipeline. |

The offshore installation activities including the drilling and completion of wells, the installation of wellheads, the manifold and associated protection structures, as well as the pipework between the various elements of the seabed facilities in the Corrib Field are near completion. The offshore pipeline from the field to the landfall is due to be installed this year, along with the outfall pipeline and a conduit through which the offshore umbilical will be pulled into the landfall during next year's construction season. Landfall and nearshore activities are currently ongoing in preparation for the offshore pipelay and subsequent seabed reinstatement. The offshore umbilical between the manifolds and the landfall is scheduled to be laid in 2010.

Construction of the Bellanaboy Bridge Gas terminal commenced in 2004. Construction is now more than 75 per cent complete and the main activities planned for 2010 are testing and commissioning of the plant itself.

The Mayo Galway pipeline has been effectively completed.

As described in the Planning Statement, environmental impact statements have accompanied all the main statutory applications for the Corrib Field Development, namely:

- With the planning application in 2002: Bellanaboy Bridge Terminal, Environmental Impact Statement, April 2001.
- With the Plan of Development in 2001:
 - Corrib Natural Gas Field Development, Bellanaboy Bridge Terminal, Environmental Impact Statement, April 2001; and

- Corrib Natural Gas Field Development (Offshore Field to Terminal) Environmental Impact Statement, October 2001. This EIS included all aspects of the offshore development including the seabed installation and offshore gas pipeline and covered the Corrib onshore gas pipeline from the landfall to the terminal;
- With the application in 2001 for Consent to Construct a Pipeline: Corrib Natural Gas Field Development (Offshore Field to Terminal), Environmental Impact Statement, October 2001;
- With the Foreshore Licence application in 2001: Corrib Natural Gas Field Development (Offshore Field to Terminal), Environmental Impact Statement, October 2001; and
- With the planning application in 2003: Bellanaboy Bridge Gas Terminal and associated Srahmore Peat Deposition Site, Environmental Impact Statement, December 2003. This EIS was also submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency in relation to SEPIL's application for an Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Licence in respect of the gas terminal in 2004.

The Bord Gais application to construct the gas export pipeline, was accompanied by an EIS as follows:

- Mayo-Galway Gas Pipe Line Environmental Impact Statement (Arup Consulting Engineers, May 2001)

When assessing Enterprise Energy Ireland's proposed Plan of Development for the Corrib development in 2001 and 2002 the (then) Department of Marine and Natural Resources who were also the recipients of the applications for the associated Pipeline Consent and Foreshore Licence, and between which there was considerable overlap, chose at the time to carry out the environmental impact assessment process in a co-ordinated manner. The Minister appointed the Marine Licence Vetting Committee to examine the EIS associated with the three Ministerial Authorisations sought by Enterprise Energy Ireland. This meant that the entire project from reservoir to and including the terminal were subject to the environmental impact assessment process.

5. The 2009 Applications and Associated Environmental Impact Statements.

As outlined in the Planning Statement, several applications are currently being considered by various authorities in relation to the proposed modification of the Corrib Onshore Pipeline. These applications have been accompanied by an EIS, in accordance with statutory requirements, as follows:

- Corrib Onshore Pipeline, Environmental Impact Statement, February 2009 prepared by RPS (Volumes 1 & 2) and Tobin Consulting Engineers (Volume 3; in respect of the Srahmore Peat Deposition Site); and
- Corrib Offshore EIS including an Offshore Supplementary Update Report, February 2009.

6. Cumulative Assessments

An EIS must address likely significant direct, indirect, secondary, cumulative, short, medium and long-term, permanent and temporary, positive and negative effects of a proposed development on the environment. As required under the various consents processes referred to earlier, it has been necessary to present separate elements of the overall Corrib project to the different competent authorities, and the EIS documents accompanying those separate applications have comprehensively presented and assessed each element in terms of its cumulative effect.

I will describe how the assessment of cumulative impacts and impact interactions has been dealt with in the context of the Corrib project in general and the proposed onshore pipeline development in particular. I will deal with them one by one starting with the terminal.

Corrib Natural Gas Field Development, Bellanaboy Bridge Terminal, Environmental Impact Statement, April 2001

Cumulative impacts were considered in Section 17 of this EIS. Consideration was given to all 5 elements of the overall development (referred to earlier in my statement) in accordance with EU 'Guidelines for the Assessment of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

as well as Impact Interactions’, prepared for the European Commission (1999). The assessment was based on the proposed construction programme at the time of writing, and assumed the concurrent construction of all 5 elements during the spring and summer of 2002. Predicted cumulative impacts included:

- A greater number of contractors seeking accommodation in the local area, than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Greater socioeconomic impacts including an increased demand for local services, and employment opportunities than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Higher traffic levels, noise and vibration affecting local residents than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Greater visual impact on the local landscape associated with the upstream and downstream pipelines in addition to that caused by the terminal alone.

Corrib Natural Gas Field Development, (Offshore Field to Terminal), Environmental Impact Statement, October 2001.

Cumulative impacts were considered in Section 17 of this EIS. Consideration was given to all 5 elements of the overall development in accordance with EU ‘Guidelines for the Assessment of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts as well as Impact Interactions’, prepared for the European Commission (1999). The assessment was based on the proposed construction programme at the time of writing, which assumed the concurrent construction of all 5 elements during 2002. Predicted cumulative impacts included:

- A greater number of contractors seeking accommodation in the local area than associated with the subject development alone.
- Greater socioeconomic impacts including an increased demand for local services, and employment opportunities than associated with the subject development alone.
- Higher traffic levels, noise and vibration affecting local residents than associated with the subject development alone.

Bellanaboy Bridge Gas Terminal and associated Srahmore Peat Deposition Site, Environmental Impact Statement, December 2003.

Cumulative impacts were considered in Section 18 of this EIS. Consideration was given to all 5 elements of the overall development in accordance with EU 'Guidelines for the Assessment of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts as well as Impact Interactions', prepared for the European Commission (1999). The assessment was based on a 'maximum potential impact' scenario, which assumed that the potential for cumulative impacts could be greatest during 2005 when most of the construction schedules potentially coincided. The assessment also considered other potential developments in the vicinity that may have interacted with the construction of the Bellanaboy Bridge Gas Terminal. These were:

- The construction of a small gas-fired power station at Bellacorick, which had planning permission;
- the proposed demolition of the ESB peat-fired power station at Bellacorick which was due to close by 2005; and
- the possible development of a wind farm on the site of the ESB peat fired power station at Bellacorick, for 192 turbines and which was proposed to be developed over a 10-year period.

Predicted cumulative impacts included:

- A greater number of employment opportunities than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Greater positive socioeconomic impacts including an increased demand for local services and accommodation than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Higher traffic levels, noise and vibration affecting local residents than associated with the terminal development alone.
- Temporary visual impact on the local landscape greater than associated with the terminal development alone.

The majority of predicted impacts were associated with and arising from the concurrent construction of several elements of the Corrib development in combination with the other potential developments identified.

Offshore Supplementary Update Report, February 2009

Cumulative impacts are presented in Section 17 of the Supplementary Update Report. Consideration was given to the five elements of the overall development in accordance with EU ‘Guidelines for the Assessment of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts as well as Impact Interactions’, prepared for the European Commission (1999). The assessment was based on the proposed construction programme at the time of writing, taking into account works already undertaken. Predicted cumulative impacts included:

- Higher traffic levels and noise than associated with the offshore development alone,
- Temporary visual impact on the local landscape greater than associated with the offshore development alone.
- Greater positive socioeconomic impacts including an increased demand for local services and accommodation than associated with the offshore development alone.

Corrib Onshore Pipeline, Environmental Impact Statement, February 2009.

Cumulative impacts are presented in Section 17 of Volume 1 of this EIS.

Indirect impacts including those associated with the road maintenance works discussed in the Statement on roads and traffic, as well as aggregate extraction, economic impact and impacts associated with mitigation measures are discussed in Section 17.1. This also includes an assessment of the impacts associated with mitigation measures, and how these in turn have been subject to mitigation (see Table 17.1).

The EIS has considered inter-relationships between aspects of the environment likely to be affected. While almost all environmental aspects are inter-related to some degree only the inter-relationships with potential for significant impact were taken into consideration in this assessment. Details of this assessment are provided in Table 17.2 of the EIS for the construction phase of the onshore pipeline. It shows that potential inter-relationships identified in respect of the construction phase of the project mainly affect community and ecology. However, as the proposed mitigation measures will

reduce and where possible eliminate the potential for these temporary effects to occur, these interactions will be avoided or significantly reduced.

The interaction of seasonal sensitivities and potential impacts on the environment has been discussed in Section 17.2. These have also, where relevant, been dealt with for each of the environmental elements covered by the EIS.

Cumulative impacts are described in Section 17.3 of Volume 1 of the Onshore Pipeline EIS. The assessment of cumulative impacts and impact interactions was undertaken with regard to EPA documents 'Guidelines on the Information to be contained in Environmental Impact Statements 2002' and 'Advice Notes on Current Practice (in the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements)' 2003. It was also prepared with consideration to the EU 'Guidelines for the Assessment of Indirect and Cumulative Impacts as well as Impact Interactions', prepared for the European Commission (1999). The assessment was based on the proposed construction programme for the onshore pipeline and the other elements of the Corrib development, taking into account the current status of works and the plans for the remaining construction activities.

Predicted cumulative impacts include:

- Higher traffic levels and potential for noise and dust emissions than associated with the onshore gas pipeline alone.
- Temporary visual impact on the local landscape greater than associated with the onshore gas pipeline development alone.
- Greater positive socioeconomic impacts including an increased demand for local services and accommodation than associated with the onshore gas pipeline alone.

As set out in Table 17.7 of Volume 1 of the EIS, due to the construction of the onshore pipeline coinciding with activities at the gas terminal site, there is potential for cumulative impacts on the human and natural environment to arise, but these are generally predicted to be temporary in nature.

On the approach to the terminal between Chainages 91.6 and 92.4 approximately, the pipeline will be installed in the stone road previously constructed, thereby reducing the cumulative effects in that location.

As the onshore pipeline is proposed to be installed after the construction of the offshore pipeline, the duration of the temporary disturbance at the landfall will be greater than that associated with the onshore pipeline alone.

The pull-in to the landfall of the offshore umbilical is scheduled to occur during the period when the onshore pipeline is being constructed. This will lead to increased disturbance in the area of the landfall site, particularly in terms of traffic, noise and visual amenity, however this is expected to be of short duration.

The EIS concludes that the construction activities associated with all elements of the Project are predicted to result in temporary negative cumulative impacts on terrestrial ecology, but that these will not be additive in terms of temporary loss (i.e. in combination they do not result in a greater impact) on ecological resources such as SAC or natural habitats.

A concern has been raised in relation to the nature and magnitude of ecological and environmental impact resulting from the proposed onshore pipeline in combination with the development of the gas terminal and the programme for peatland restoration and bog rehabilitation at Srahmore.

The specific issues raised in relation to nature and magnitude of impact on peatland, including habitats and species for the route of the pipeline and the peat deposition site at Srahmore have been addressed in the Statement on Terrestrial Ecology.

The potential impacts on the hydrology along the route of and in the area of the pipeline have been dealt with in the Statement on Eco-Hydrology / Eco-Hydrogeology.

These Statements have concluded that there will be no significant impact on the ecology and hydrology as a result of the proposed onshore pipeline development.

Similarly, the Geotechnical Statement which outlined the stability aspects of the onshore pipeline in areas of peat concluded that it could be constructed safely along the proposed route.

Having regard to the above and provided that the mitigation measures set out in the EIS and as elaborated on by these three experts are implemented, it is predicted that the development of the onshore pipeline will not cause significant cumulative impact on ecology or the wider environment, and there will be no significant interactions arising from same.

7. Landfall

SEPIL is currently preparing to install the offshore pipeline between the Corrib Field and the landfall at Glengad. In preparation for questions in relation to this as set out in the Board's letter of 12th May, I will now outline the nature of the ongoing works.

The works to be carried out during the 2009 season are set out in the Environmental Management Plan approved by the Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources in April this year. The works include the preparation of the landfall site including the setting up of the site, the installation of temporary facilities (portacabins), the cutting of the cliff and preparation of a ramp to the foreshore, and the excavation and installation of hold-back anchors and a winch.

Following the laying of a guidewire from a vessel located seaward of the landfall site, and the pulling in of this wire with the winch (held in place by anchors) to the landfall site, the offshore pipelay vessel will arrive in position off the landfall, commence welding sections of pipe which will be attached to the guidewire, and gradually pulled in to the landfall. Once the pipe has reached the landfall site near the location of the Landfall Valve Installation, the offshore pipelay vessel will lay pipe away from the landfall and towards the Corrib field. The winch and anchors will then be removed, the pipeline buried and the landfall site reinstated including the removal of temporary facilities. Excavated and stored topsoil may remain stored on the site until after the onshore pipeline construction has been completed in order to minimise disturbance to the existing seedbank.

The construction of the onshore pipeline will entail re-erecting temporary facilities at the landfall site to enable construction of the pipeline and LVI, the cumulative impacts of which will include increased traffic, noise, dust and visual disturbance.

8. The outfall pipeline

In preparation for questions in relation to the outfall pipeline as set out in the Board's letter of 12th May, I will now describe the waste water which is intended to be discharged through the water outfall, located at a point some 12.7 km offshore from the landfall at Glengad. This waste water stream arises from two potential sources at the terminal, namely rainwater and firewater drained from the terminal footprint.

Drainage water from the paved hydrocarbon processing areas of the terminal footprint will be routed to an open drain system, and treated in a tilted plate separator (TPS) and a polishing unit, prior to discharge.

Firewater is water that is held in the firewater pond, and will always be a mixture of clean rainwater and mains water. In the event of the firewater system being activated, the firewater runoff from paved areas could become contaminated with fire fighting foam and with liquids present in the plant. Firewater runoff from paved areas will be carried in the open drain system, and routed to a firewater retention pond. From there the water is transferred to a tilted plate separator and an ultrafiltration unit for treatment. The treated water will then be tested to ensure compliance with all appropriate standards prior to being discharged to sea via the outfall.

The discharge through the outfall will be subject to the IPPC licence for the terminal. SEPIL has recently written to the Environmental Protection Agency seeking an amendment to the current licence, to reflect the proposal I have just described.

9. Summary

To summarise: The current application relates to a modification to the route of the onshore gas pipeline from the landfall at Glengad to the Bellanaboy Bridge Gas Terminal including a proposed landfall valve installation at Glengad. The capacity of the facilities has not changed since 2001 and the project as a whole remains in accordance with the Plan of Development, which was approved in 2002 and for which an EIA process was conducted for the whole project from the Corrib field to and including the terminal.

Environmental Impact Statements have been prepared and an assessment of cumulative impact and impact interactions has been carried out in association with each of the main application processes for the Corrib development.

Several of the elements of the Corrib Field Development are close to completion, and if it granted permission, the onshore pipeline project with associated peat deposition at Srahmore will constitute the main construction effort in the area as scheduled to occur in 2010.

The impact interactions and cumulative impacts associated with the onshore pipeline development have been considered in the context of the other elements of the Corrib project development. The main impacts associated with the onshore pipeline development arise from the construction of the pipeline and are of a temporary nature. Accordingly, the majority of the impact interactions and cumulative impacts are temporary.

10. Conclusion

To conclude: With this application and the concurrent applications to other statutory bodies for the Corrib pipeline, SEPIL has actively sought to minimise any confusion or frustration arising due to the numerous consents processes by means of submitting a robust and comprehensive EIS that addresses the proposed development in terms of its overall development context, and any likely significant cumulative effect or impact interactions arising from the development on the environment. The EIS documentation has been shared between the various applications, and the application have, whenever

possible, been made concurrently to enable to the greatest extent possible, a holistic approach to the environmental impact assessment process.

11. Conditions

Inspector, I now wish to address some of the Conditions which were suggested as being appropriate by Mayo County Council (in their written submission to the Board) in the event that Approval is granted for the proposed development. You will note that some of these Conditions have been referred to in either the Traffic and Roads or Terrestrial Ecology Statements previously presented at this Hearing. However, for ease of reference, I will again make note of those Conditions, along with others which have not previously been mentioned.

In this regard, I intend to read the Condition as sought by Mayo County Council, followed by the suggested amendment and, in the case of those Conditions which have not previously been addressed in an earlier Statement of Evidence, the associated reasoning for seeking the proposed change.

I will start with those Conditions which have previously been mentioned in earlier Statements. In the interests of avoiding undue repetition, I do not intend to restate the reasoning behind the changes sought in respect of these Conditions.

Condition number 1(iv) as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Prior to the commencement of development the developers (and their successors in title) shall enter into legally binding agreement(s) with the planning authority under section 47 of the Planning and Development Act, 2000. The agreement(s) shall provide for the following:

(iv) full implementation of the Traffic Management Plan in the EIS submitted to the An Bord Pleanála and any subsequent amendments arising from reviews of that TMP approved by the Project Monitoring Committee.”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“... The agreement(s) shall provide for the following:

(iv) full implementation of the Traffic Management Plan in the EIS submitted to An Bord Pleanála and any subsequent amendments arising from reviews of that TMP approved by Mayo County Council following consultation with the Project Monitoring Committee.”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 4(a) as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“The following traffic management measures shall apply:

(a) haulage of all excavated peat from the pipeline wayleave site to the Deposition site shall be restricted to the designated Haul Route. No haulage of peat shall commence until such time as the proposed improvements of the Haul Route and the return route are completed.”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“The following traffic management measures shall apply:

(a) haulage of all excavated peat from the pipeline wayleave site to the Deposition site shall be restricted to the designated Haul Route.

(b) Use of any given section of the designated Haul Route for haulage of peat shall not, unless otherwise agreed with Mayo County Council, commence until such time as any necessary preventative maintenance works to that section of the Haul Route, are completed. The scope of the preventative maintenance works shall be agreed with Mayo County Council.”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 4(d) as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“The following traffic management measures shall apply:

(d) A school traffic warden shall be engaged to travel on each of the school buses using the Haul Route so as to facilitate the safe embarking / alighting and road crossing by children at all times during the haulage of peat.”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“The following traffic management measures shall apply:

(d) A school traffic warden shall be engaged to travel on each of the school buses using the Haul Route, or in a separate vehicle travelling with each of the school buses, so as to facilitate the safe embarking / alighting and road crossing by children at all times during the haulage of peat.”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 7(a) as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“All vehicles leaving the construction areas of the sites shall pass through a wheel wash.”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“(a) All construction related vehicles travelling from the construction areas of the sites onto the public road network shall be inspected and cleaned where necessary, either manually or with automated wheel washers.

(b) During construction, road cleanliness shall be maintained through the use of road sweepers.”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 9 as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“An independent safety audit on the upgraded haul route shall be carried out and agreed with the planning authority prior to the commencement of haulage of peat and construction materials”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“Prior to the commencement of haulage of peat and construction materials along any given section of the haul route, an independent safety audit on that section of the haul route shall be carried out and agreed with the planning authority.”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 36 as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“The developer shall pay a special contribution under section 48(2)(c) of the Planning and Development Acts 2000 – 2006 in respect of road improvement works required to facilitate the haulage of materials to the pipeline wayleave, namely the strengthening, widening and realignment of local roads specified in Table 2.1 of Appendix E – the Traffic Management Plan of the EIS submitted to An Bord Pleanála...”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“The developer shall pay a special contribution under section 48(2)(c) of the Planning and Development Acts 2000 – 2007 in respect of road improvement works required to facilitate the haulage of materials to the pipeline wayleave, namely the necessary works to those local roads specified in Table 2.1 of Appendix E – the Traffic Management Plan of the EIS submitted to An Bord Pleanála...”

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Traffic and Roads. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

Condition number 27 as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“The developer shall carry out a (sic) baseline ecological surveys of areas along the wayleave where access was not possible prior to any vegetation clearance or construction commencing and any ecological surveys which were carried out outside the optimum period for such surveys should be repeated during the optimum survey period prior to commencement of development.

Reason: In order to provide comprehensive baseline data to facilitate necessary monitoring and protection of salmonid habitats in the area.”

The amendment sought to this Condition is as follows:

“Areas of dense vegetation affected by the development which could not be thoroughly searched shall be monitored by appropriate experts during vegetation clearance.

Reason: In order to provide necessary faunal monitoring”.

(The reasoning for this has previously been presented in the Statement relating to Terrestrial Ecology. As such, I do not intend to restate it at this juncture.)

I shall now deal with Conditions which have not previously been mentioned in earlier Statements of Evidence presented at this Hearing.

In this regard, Condition numbers 10, 11 and 12 suggested by Mayo County Council all relate to quantified risk assessment.

More specifically, Condition number 10 suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Before the commissioning of the landfall valve installation and pipeline, the developer shall submit to the planning authority a certified Safety Audit in relation to the installation of the landfall valve installation and pipeline within the planning application site, and the agreement of the planning authority shall be received.”

Condition Number 11 suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“The Safety Audit shall be prepared and certified by an independent qualified and competent person or body. Such body or person, and the precise form of the Safety Audit, which shall include Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analysis of the specified combined components, shall be agreed with the planning authority. The Safety Audit shall also be submitted to the Health and Safety Authority and the Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources at the same time as it is submitted to the Planning Authority.

Reason: It is necessary that the cumulative impacts of the upstream pipeline and terminal components within the application site are assessed and a Safety Audit is prepared and certified in the interest of public health and safety.”

Condition number 12 suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Any amendment to the permitted scheme which relates to the control or impact of major accident hazards (as defined by Seveso II Directive), but which does not materially alter the permitted development, shall be subject to notification and agreement of the planning authority, following consultation with the Health and Safety Authority.

Reason: In the interest of health and safety”

It is SEPIL’s suggestion that these Conditions all be omitted. This is on the basis that the Planning Authority’s remit does not extend to matters of health and safety in respect of the proposed pipeline and LVI. The same applies in relation to the HSA. Rather, as confirmed by the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources in their written submission to An Bord Pleanála (dated 11th May 2009)

“The Minister for Energy is currently responsible for upstream gas safety...It is intended that responsibility for upstream gas safety be transferred to CER [Commission for Energy Regulation] once suitable legislation can be enacted.”

This being the case, it is our submission that there is no requirement for the Conditions sought by Mayo County Council (notwithstanding that the information sought by Condition number. 10 as suggested by the Planning Authority has already been provided as part of the Quantified Risk Assessment contained in Appendix Q7 of Volume 2 of the EIS) to be included.

Condition number 15(b) as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Prior to the commencement of development commences (sic), the developer shall obtain the agreement of the planning authority for an Environmental Management System (EMS), specific to the construction of the pipeline and LVI sites. The EMS shall include as a minimum the following:

(a) Management and Reporting Structure.

(b) Schedule of Environmental Objectives and Targets, including objectives for the minimisation of suspended solids movement to surface water systems, and effective management of all silt and settlement pond flow discharges during periods of high precipitation

(c) An Environmental management Programme

(d) Corrective Action Procedures

(e) Awareness and Training Programme

(f) Communications Programme

The developer shall implement the agreed EMS for the duration of the earthworks and construction phase of the development. On written request by the planning authority, the developer shall submit a report on any specific environmental matter or an environmental audit”

The suggested amendment to this Condition concerns clause (b) and also inserts an additional clause (g), as follows:

“Prior to the commencement of development, the developer shall obtain the agreement of the planning authority for an Environmental Management System (EMS), specific to the construction of the pipeline and LVI sites. The EMS shall include as a minimum the following:

(a) (remains unchanged)

(b) Schedule of Environmental Objectives and Targets.

(c), (d), (e) & (f) (all remain unchanged)

(g) Details of surface water management during construction to prevent runoff from the site onto the public roads, unnatural flooding and/or the occurrence of any deleterious matter in existing watercourses in accordance with CIRIA Technical Guide: Control of Water Pollution from Linear Construction Projects (C648, 2006)."

The rationale for seeking this change is that in the EIS, management of surface water is proposed to be one of the matters addressed in an Environmental Management Plan to be developed (as specified in Section 5.13.2 of Volume 1 of the EIS), along with associated monitoring programmes. In this regard, I note that An Bord Pleanála has seen fit to impose similar conditions to that now proposed in respect of the LNG pipeline from the Shannon LNG Regasification Terminal at Ralappane, Co Kerry to the existing natural gas network at Leahys, Co. Limerick (ABP Ref. 08.GA0003) and in respect of the pipeline linking the existing Curraleigh West, Co. Tipperary Above Ground Installation and the compressor station located near Middleton, Co. Cork (ABP Ref. 04.GA0002). It is the Applicant's view that the suggested Condition is in keeping with those specified by the Board in respect of these other permitted pipeline developments and that it would be appropriate in this instance.

The next proposed change relates to two of the Conditions suggested by Mayo County Council (numbers 17 and 31, both relating to monitoring), which SEPIL is now seeking to have amalgamated into one Condition which relates back to the EMP referred to in Condition number 15. This being the case, I will first read both Condition 17 and 31, followed by the suggested amalgamated Condition and the associated reasoning.

Condition number 17 as suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

"All surface water discharges from the disturbed area of the sites shall be channelled through settlement ponds. Prior to commencement of development, the developer shall agree with the planning authority precise details of a monitoring programme for the settlement ponds and their discharge, and a maintenance programme for the ponds. Parameters to be monitored shall include

(a) temperature

(b) turbidity

(c) dissolved oxygen

- (d) electrical conductivity*
- (e) orthophosphate*
- (f) total phosphorus*
- (g) nitrate*
- (h) ammonia (as N)*
- (i) suspended solids*

and any other parameter required by the planning authority. The frequency and methods of monitoring shall be agreed in advance of the operation of the settlement ponds with the planning authority. Any alterations to the agreed monitoring regime or maintenance programme shall be subject to agreement with the planning authority, following consultation with the PMC.

Reason: In the interest of environmental protection and the proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

Condition number 31 suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Before development commences on the sites, the developer shall obtain the agreement of the planning authority for a monitoring plan in relation to surface water, ground water, dust and continuous noise. Such monitoring shall be carried out by the developer throughout the construction of the pipeline and LVI (to the date of commissioning of the pipeline and LVI). The monitoring plan shall, as a minimum, include

- (a) A list of all monitoring locations*
- (b) Description and specification of equipment to be used,*
- (c) The identity and qualifications of persons responsible for monitoring,*
- (d) Parameters to be used*
- (e) Monitoring intervals*
- (f) Averaging times*
- (g) Proposal for the presentation of data*
- (h) Codes of practice to be used and*

Details of right of access to MCC appointed staff to carry out environmental monitoring checks as required, or as requested by the PMC. Costs incurred by the planning authority in carrying out any necessary monitoring, monitoring checks, inspections and environmental audits, shall be reimbursed by the developer.

Reason: In the interest of proper environmental control during the earthworks and construction phase”

The suggested amalgamated Condition to encapsulate the intent of both these Conditions is as follows:

“The EMS referred to in Condition 15 shall provide for monitoring of surface water, dust and noise. The monitoring shall be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Mayo County Council and, in respect of surface water, shall be in accordance with CIRIA Technical Guidance: Control of Water Pollution from Linear Construction Projects (C648, 2006).

Any alterations to the agreed monitoring regime shall be subject to agreement with the planning authority, following consultation with the PMC. Such monitoring shall be carried out by the developer throughout the construction of the pipeline and LVI (to the date of commissioning of the pipeline and LVI).

The monitoring plan contained in the EMS shall provide details of right of access to MCC appointed staff to carry out environmental monitoring checks as required, or as requested by the PMC. Costs incurred by the planning authority in carrying out any necessary monitoring, monitoring checks, inspections and environmental audits, shall be reimbursed by the developer.

Reason: In the interest of proper environmental control during the earthworks and construction phase”

The rationale for seeking this change is essentially two-fold. Firstly, having regard to the proposal relating to Condition 15(b) whereby it is suggested that surface water management be carried out in accordance with CIRIA guidance (similar to the requirements imposed by An Bord Pleanála in respect of the aforementioned Strategic Gas Infrastructure Developments (ABP Refs. GA0002 and GA0003)), and in light of the physical space constraints that exist, it is proposed that this Condition be amended to facilitate monitoring based on surface water management that is not required to rely on settlement ponds for filtration. It is SEPIL’s view that the intent of Condition 17 as

originally proposed by Mayo County Council will be adequately covered through the suggested amended wording.

Secondly, in respect of the intent of Condition number 31, it is SEPIL's view that the proposed amalgamation avoids unnecessary duplication of Conditions, and, in any event, we consider requirements relating to monitoring are best set out in a Condition which relates back to the Environmental Management System covered in Condition Number 15.

Condition number 32 suggested by Mayo County Council requires that:

“Prior to the commencement of development, a Project Management Committee (PMC) shall be established to monitor geotechnical risks set out in the Geotechnical Risk Register, the ecological monitoring plan, the environmental monitoring plan, surface water run-off, drainage control, implementation of the restoration and landscape plan and other environmental issues contained in the EIS submitted to An Bord Pleanála, traffic management and road maintenance and other matters relating to the overall management of the project. The PMC shall comprise two representatives of the developer, two representatives of Mayo County Council, and an invitation shall be extended to the North West Regional Fisheries Board, the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government and the Environmental Protection Agency to provide one representative each for the committee. In addition, two representatives of the local community, selected in accordance with procedures to be agreed with the planning authority, shall be invited to serve on this committee. The PMC shall have the right to co-opt other members as required. The Mayo County Manager or his/ her nominee shall chair the PMC. Details of the mode of operation for the committee, including the frequency of meetings, reporting and liaising arrangements with other persons and bodies, shall be agreed with the planning authority before development commences.

Reason: To ensure effective monitoring during construction in the interest of proper planning and sustainable development of the area.”

The proposed amendment to this Condition is very minor and only relates to the make-up of the PMC. As such, I do not propose to read the entirety of the amended Condition, only that part which incorporates the change that is sought:

“...The PMC shall comprise two representatives of the developer, two representatives of Mayo County Council, and an invitation shall be extended to the Department of Communications, Energy and Natural Resources, North West Regional Fisheries Board, the National Parks and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, the Environmental Protection Agency and Bord na Mona to provide one representative each for the committee...”

This requested change is a reflection of the fact that a Project Management Committee was established and meets regularly in relation to matters pertaining to the construction of the Bellanaboy Bridge Terminal Site. The setting up of such a Committee was in fact a Condition attaching to the permission for the Terminal Site (Condition No. 34 refers). It is considered that in addition to those members previously required to form part of the Committee, given the nature and extent of the proposed development, it would also be appropriate for representatives from the DCENR and Bord na Mona to be on the Committee. Also, for the avoidance of doubt, it is considered that it should be specified that the representative from the DoEHLG should come from within the NPWS.