

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Errata Sheet

NRW MLT Application Reference: ORML2429T

Document Reference: S_NRWML_5

Document Number: MOCNS-J3303-RPS-10428

13 November 2024

F01



Image of an offshore wind farm

MONA OFFSHORE WIND PROJECT

Document status					
Version	Purpose of document	Authored by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Review date
F01	NRW Marine Licence	RPS	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	Mona Offshore Wind Ltd	13 Nov 2024
Prepared by:		Prepared for:			
Mona Offshore Wind Ltd		Mona Offshore Wind Ltd.			

Contents

1	ERRATA SHEET	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Errata list.....	2
1.2.1	HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (E1.2)	2
1.2.2	HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (E1.3 F02)	3
1.2.3	HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (E1.4 F02)	4
1.2.4	Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (F1.3)	5
1.2.5	Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (F2.2).....	6
1.2.6	Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (F2.3)	7
1.2.7	Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (F2.4)	8
1.2.8	Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (F2.7)	9
1.2.9	Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (F2.8)	10
1.2.10	Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (F2.9).....	11
1.2.11	Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (F4.1)	12
1.2.12	Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (F5.5.1).....	13
1.2.13	Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (F6.2.2).....	14
1.2.14	Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (F6.5.5) ...	15
1.2.15	Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (F6.5.6)	16
1.2.16	Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (F6.7.1)	17
1.2.17	Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (F6.8.4)	18
1.2.18	Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (F8.1.1)	19
1.2.19	Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (J18 F02)	20
1.2.20	Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (J21)	21

1 Errata Sheet

1.1 Overview

- 1.1.1.1 On 21 May 2024, the application by Mona Offshore Wind Limited (the Applicant) for a standalone Natural Resources Wales (NRW) Marine Licence was submitted to the NRW Marine Licensing Team (MLT). Following the initial submission of documents, the Applicant has reviewed the application documentation for any errors or inconsistencies. The following sections provide correction or clarification of matters identified.

1.2 Errata list

1.2.1 HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (E1.2)

Table 1.1: HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Two: Special Areas of Conservation (SACs) Assessments (E1.2) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.5	It is mentioned that the Offshore CMS is expected to be secured within the deemed marine licence in Schedule 14 of the draft DCO and expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. The reference to the deemed marine licence in the DCO is incorrect, the offshore CMS is only expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence
Table 1.78	The West Wales Marine SAC should have been included in Table 1.78 but was not – however, it was included in the assessment.
Table 1.85	For grey seal, the initiation (first strike) impact range at 4,400 kJ is listed as 25 m. The initiation (first strike) impact range at 4,400 kJ should be 28 m, however, this does not change the conclusions of the assessment.
Table 1.220	EMF is listed as an impact in Column 4, it should not be.

1.2.2 HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (E1.3 F02)

Table 1.2: HRA Stage 2 Information to Support an Appropriate Assessment Part Three: Special Protection Areas and Ramsar sites Assessments (E1.3 F02) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.19	The annual impact on razorbill from Skomer, Skokholm and the Seas off Pembrokeshire/ Sgomer, Sgogwm a Moroedd Penfro SPA is incorrectly stated to be 2.91. The correct figure is 0.4.

1.2.3 HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (E1.4 F02)

Table 1.3: HRA Stage 1 Screening Report (E1.4 F02) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Part C of paragraph 1.4.6.49	It is stated that the estimated mortality of lesser black-backed gull of 0.1 to 0.2 birds is for the combined impact of collision plus displacement. The estimated mortality of lesser black-backed gull of 0.1 to 0.2 birds is for collision impacts only.
Part C of paragraph 1.4.6.49	It is incorrectly stated that the estimated mortality of black-legged kittiwake is 0 birds for the combined impact of collisions plus displacement. The correct figure is 0.1.

1.2.4 Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (F1.3)

Table 1.4: Volume 1, Chapter 3: Project description (F1.3) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Glossary table Term: Micrositing	The definition of micrositing was given as ‘The final selection of the position of infrastructure which may move in the order of a few metres to avoid an obstruction.’ It is possible that micrositing may involve moving the position of infrastructure up to 100 m. For clarity it is confirmed that micrositing will not involve moving the position of any infrastructure outwith the Mona Offshore Wind Project Offshore Order Limits.
Paragraph 3.5.6.2	States ‘However, the final layout of the wind turbines will be confirmed through the design plan submitted to NRW for approval in consultation with Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) and Trinity House prior to commencement of construction offshore and secured within the deemed marine licence (dML) in the Draft DCO (Document Reference C1) submitted with the application for development consent and expected to be secured in the standalone NRW marine licence.’ The final layout will also include the location of the offshore substation platforms (OSPs) as well as the wind turbines.
Paragraph 3.5.8.7	States that ‘up to two vessels may be piling and two other vessels drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15 km between locations’. This should state that ‘up to two vessels may be piling or drilling simultaneously, with concurrent piling being undertaken at a maximum distance of 15 km between locations’.
Table 3.22	The maximum number of crossings is listed as 24, it should be 14.

1.2.5 Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (F2.2)

Table 1.5: Volume 2, Chapter 2: Benthic and subtidal ecology (F2.2) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 2.19	Table 2.19 states that 'A 50 m exclusion buffer will be in place to avoid the <i>Sabellaria alveolata</i> reef and <i>Mytilus edulis</i> bed at the landfall is included in the Landfall construction method statement which is expected to be secured within the standalone NRW marine licence. It should state that the 50 m exclusion buffer will be secured within the offshore construction method statement expected to be secured as a condition of the standalone NRW marine licence.

1.2.6 Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (F2.3)

Table 1.6: Volume 2, Chapter 3: Fish and shellfish ecology (F2.3) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 3.18	The Maximum Design Scenario incorrectly states that clearance of up to 23 UXOs will be required. The correct number is 22 UXOs, which is what has been assessed, this error is purely typographical and in Table 3.18 only.

1.2.7 Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (F2.4)

Table 1.7: Volume 2, Chapter 4: Marine mammals (F2.4) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 4.9.3.38	The duration of piling is described as up to 113 days, within a two-year piling programme (as defined in Table 4.22). The correct duration of piling is actually up to 113.5 days.
Paragraph 4.9.5.22	It is stated that 'Multiplying the area of ensonification by each species-specific density would lead to unrealistic estimates, as serious disturbance would not occur over ranges such as 23 km'. It should state that serious disturbance would not occur over ranges such as 4.08 km.
Paragraph A.3.8.1.4	A cross-reference incorrectly states that 'The iPCoD models were set up as described in sections A.3.2 and A.3.3 for demographic parameters and reference populations, respectively, and with the same days of residual disturbance specified in section 0'. The same days of residual disturbance are specified in section A.3.4.

1.2.8 Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (F2.7)

Table 1.8: Volume 2, Chapter 7: Shipping and navigation (F2.7) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 7.18	The list of Example Vessels (2019-2022) should not include Stena Mersey, Stena Horizon, Stena Lagan, Stena Forecaster or Stena Forerunner. However, it should include Stena Estrid and Stena Foreteller.
Table 7.18	The Approximate Annual Crossings (2022) is given as 1,442. It should instead be 1,098.
Table 7.18	The Baseline Distance is given as 142.3 nm. It should instead be 113.3 nm.
Table 7.18	The Deviated Distance is given as 144.6 nm. It should instead be 114.4 nm.
Table 7.18	The Additional Mona Offshore Wind Project Time is given as +7.4 minutes. It should instead be +3.4 minutes.

1.2.9 Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (F2.8)

Table 1.9: Volume 2, Chapter 8: Seascape and visual resources (F2.8) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraphs 8.8.3.8, 8.8.3.23, 8.8.3.39, 8.8.3.45, 8.8.3.59, 8.8.3.75, 8.8.3.105, 8.8.3.120, 8.8.3.134, 8.8.3.200, 8.8.4.19, 8.8.4.32, 8.8.4.45, 8.8.4.71, 8.8.4.97, 8.8.4.236, 8.8.4.249, 8.8.4.262, 8.8.4.275, 8.8.4.288, 8.8.4.340, 8.8.4.353, 8.8.4.366, 8.8.4.379, 8.8.4.392, 8.8.4.405, 8.8.4.457, 8.8.4.470, 8.8.4.548, 8.8.4.574	These paragraphs included the text '(i.e. very good visibility 20 km to 40 km approximately 70% of the year)'. This text should read '(i.e. very good visibility 20 km to 40 km approximately 40% of the year)'.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.61, 8.8.4.512, 8.8.4.525	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.62, 8.8.4.513, 8.8.4.526	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.65, 8.8.4.516, 8.8.4.529	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Paragraphs 8.8.4.66, 8.8.4.517, 8.8.4.530	The sensitivity of views/visual amenity of people at this viewpoint was incorrectly stated to be very high. The sensitivity should instead be high.
Table 8.13	The definition for very high sensitivity should, in addition to internationally designated landscapes, also include important views from nationally designated landscapes. The definition for high sensitivity should, in addition to nationally designated landscape, also include important views from regionally designated landscapes.
Table 8.23 (Viewpoints 6, 52 and 53)	The sensitivities of these viewpoints were listed as very high for the Construction (C), Operations and maintenance (O) and Decommissioning (D) phases. For all phases, the sensitivity should instead be high.
Figure A.4	It is stated that ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 324 m. ZTV is calculated using a blade tip height of 364 m.

1.2.10 Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (F2.9)

Table 1.10: Volume 2, Chapter 9: Marine archaeology (F2.9) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 9.16	<p>The extents of the following AEZs were incorrectly given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID: Mona_0009 AEZ(m) was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 100 extents • ID: Mona_0040 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0067 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0014 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0025 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0033 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0038 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0044 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0065 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents

1.2.11 Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (F4.1)

Table 1.11: Volume 4, Chapter 1: Aviation and radar (F4.1) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4	A cross-reference incorrectly states that the potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 0. The potential impacts of the Mona Offshore Wind Project during the construction, operations and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are considered in section 1.4.

1.2.12 Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (F5.5.1)

Table 1.12: Volume 5, Annex 5.1: Cumulative effects screening matrix (F5.5.1) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Section 1.9	The screening for Commercial Fisheries for the Dublin Array Offshore Wind Farm is incorrectly listed as 'a' whereas it should be 'c'.

1.2.13 Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (F6.2.2)

Table 1.13: Volume 6, Annex 2.2: Water Framework Directive Coastal Waters Assessment (F6.2.2) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.4.1.1	The text incorrectly refers to a 12 km buffer for features under consideration for the WFD assessment. This should refer to a buffer of 2 km. The assessment used a distance of 2 km; therefore, the conclusions are unaffected by this discrepancy in the text.

1.2.14 Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (F6.5.5)

Table 1.14: Volume 6, Annex 5.5: Offshore Ornithology Apportioning Technical Report (F6.5.5) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.3	An incorrect mortality rate was applied to calculation of adult baseline mortality. The baseline mortality should be 218.25 birds for Pen-y-Gogarth/Great Orme SSSI, and the baseline mortality should be 79.17 birds for Creigiau Rhiwledyn/Little Ormes Head SSSI.

1.2.15 Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (F6.5.6)

Table 1.15: Volume 6, Annex 5.6: Offshore Ornithology Population Viability Analysis Technical Report (F6.5.6) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Appendix A A.1.1 Great Ormes Head Model A.1.2 Little Ormes Head Model	An incorrect productivity rate of 0.532 was used for the Great Ormes Head PVA and the Little Ormes Head PVA. The correct productivity rate has been used in the Offshore Ornithology Assessment of Pen y Gogarth / Great Orme's Head SSSI (S_D1_25 F02).

1.2.16 Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (F6.7.1)

Table 1.16: Volume 6, Annex 7.1: Navigation Risk Assessment (F6.7.1) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Paragraph 1.5.4.1	The local coastguard base for the region was incorrectly named as Holyhead Coastguard Operations Centre. The correct name is Holyhead Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre.
Paragraph 1.8.2.4	The relevant paragraph reference of NPS EN-3 is incorrectly given as 2.6.161. The correct paragraph reference is 2.8.187.
Paragraph 1.9.3.6	The text incorrectly states that 'Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, with existing mitigation, or Unacceptable'. It should state that Hazards are then defined as either Broadly Acceptable, Tolerable if ALARP, or Unacceptable.
Paragraph 7.2.1.1.4 of Appendix E	The relevant paragraph reference of NPS EN-3 is incorrectly given as 2.6.161. The correct paragraph reference is 2.8.187.

1.2.17 Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (F6.8.4)

Table 1.17: Volume 6, Annex 8.4: Seascape, landscape and visual resources impact assessment methodology (F6.8.4) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.2	The definition for very high sensitivity should, in addition to internationally designated landscapes, also include important views from nationally designated landscapes. The definition for high sensitivity should, in addition to nationally designated landscape, also include important views from regionally designated landscapes.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Sensitivity of receptor (value)'. It should simply read 'value'.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Sensitivity of receptor (value): community, regional, national, international'. It should read 'Value: negligible, low, medium, high and very high'.
Table 1.3	The text reads 'Value: Negligible'. It should read 'Value: Negligible – Negligible, Negligible, Negligible, Low, Low'.
Paragraph A.1.1.1.2	The maximum blade tip height of the Mona Offshore Wind Project above LAT is incorrectly stated to be 324 m. The correct figure is 364 m.

1.2.18 Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (F8.1.1)

Table 1.18: Volume 8, Annex 1.1: Aviation and radar technical report (F8.1.1) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
A.3.3.1.1	A cross-reference incorrectly states that the infrastructure assessed is shown in 'Error! Reference source not found.' The infrastructure assessed is shown in Table A. 1.

1.2.19 Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (J18 F02)

Table 1.19: Outline Offshore Written Scheme of Investigation and Protocol for Archaeological Discoveries (J18 F02) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.7	<p>The extents of the following AEZs were incorrectly given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ID: Mona_0009 AEZ(m) was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 100 extents • ID: Mona_0040 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0067 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0014 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0025 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0033 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0038 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents • ID: Mona_0044 AEZ(m): was stated to have 25 extents – it should have instead been 50 extents • ID: Mona_0065 AEZ(m): was stated to have 50 extents – it should have instead been 25 extents

1.2.20 Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (J21)

Table 1.20: Outline Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol (J21) errata.

Document section	Description of errata
Table 1.2	The use of Noise Abatement Systems (NAS) is listed as a tertiary measure. It should instead be listed as a secondary measure.