Kieran Somers

From: Niall Riordan <Niall.Riordan@ervia.ie>
Sent: Wednesday 19 July 2017 09:52
To: Kieran Somers
Subject: IW comments on record of ABP meeting 2nd June 17

Hi Kieran,

I refer to the record of the ABP meeting of 2nd June as attached and IW have the following comments as follows for your consideration:

- The final paragraph on page 2 of the Record describes the elements approved under 29N.YA0010. It refers to one of these elements as *"an extension of the effluent outfall tunnel"*. This should read as provision of a long sea outfall tunnel, rather than "an extension".

- Paragraph 3 on page 3 of the Record comments as follows; *"...the Board's representatives said that the prospective applicant might nonetheless consider including the new SBRs in the retrofitting as part of any formal planning application so as to comprehensively outline the nature and extent of the proposed development"*.
  We had a different recollection of this point. We considered that the ABP representatives did not request that the new SBRs form part of the S37E application, but that rather it was agreed that the new application would be confined to the proposed new works of reconfiguring the existing treatment tanks to facilitate AGS (and RBSF etc). IW agreed to include the new SBRs in the context of the EIS / NIS to provide a comprehensive assessment of impacts, but they would not form–part of the S37E application.

- Page 4, 4th paragraph - the discussion of the S146B application regarding amendment to Condition 1 was 'off the record'. IW requested such a discussion and the ABP representatives agreed. We would request that reference to this part of the discussion should not be in the record.

- Page 4, same paragraph - IW requested ABP to consider Irish Water's preferred approach to submit the S146B application to immediately. Irish Water also said that it could submit the S146B in tandem with the S37E application. ABP said that the S146B application should be submitted at the same time as the S37E application, if Irish Water considered that it was necessary.

- Last page 2nd paragraph – *"Use of the existing outfall for the upgraded facility in the application"* Irish Water does not recall any conversation on including the existing outfall in the new application? The only outfall discussion IW recall was looking at LSOT in alternatives?

Give me a call if you have any queries in relation to these comments.

Also can we arrange the next meeting for the 20th or 21st September? Please let me know if these dates are not suitable.

Thanks.

Regards,

Niall Riordan
Project Manager
Major Projects