

**BERKELEY NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP (SSG)**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT BERKELEY ARMS HOTEL
BERKELEY**

ON THURSDAY 1 MARCH 2007

PRESENT:

Cllr P Wride (in the chair)	-	Berkeley SSG Chairman
Cllr N Cooper	-	Berkeley SSG Vice-Chairman
Cllr D Wride	-	Stroud District Council
Cllr V Shenoi	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Mr F Baker	-	National Farmers Union
Cllr D Burgess	-	Alkington Parish Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr J Crocker	-	Site Director, Berkeley
Mr S Houston	-	ILW Store Project Lead, Berkeley Site
Mr S Payne (Secretary)	-	Public Relations, Berkeley Site
Miss T Owen	-	Public Relations, Berkeley Site
Dr D Warner	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr J Beckett	-	Environment Officer, Stroud District Council
Mr P Gilbert	-	Stroud District Council Planning
Mr A Jardine	-	Berkeley Estate/Country Landowner Assoc
Mr R Darlymple-Smith	-	Local Resident
Dr C Chudley	-	Local Resident
Dr R Hellen	-	Local Resident
Mr D Withey	-	Environment Agency
Mr D Morgan	-	Safety Inspector, Berkeley Site
Mr L Howells	-	Lower Severn Drainage Board
Mr J Howe	-	Awre Town Council
Mr J Close	-	Osborn Clarke Solicitors
Ms E Warren	-	Wotton-Under-Edge Town Council
Mr M Pirie	-	Falfield Parish Council
Mr A Jardine	-	Berkeley Estate/CLA
Ms J Barber	-	Citizen Newspaper
Ms S Postans	-	Public Relations, Oldbury P.S
Mr P Parsloe	-	Thornbury Parish Council
Mr S Ardern	-	Nuclear Technologies
Mr M Lynden	-	Oldbury Site Stakeholder Group
Mr R Avery	-	St Mary Church Berkeley
Mr A Burns	-	

I APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1 Cllr Mrs Wride welcomed members to this meeting of the Berkeley Site Stakeholder Group (SSG).

2 Apologies for absence were received from:

Mr C Evers	-	Gloucester Association of Town and Parish Councils
Tim Jones	-	British Nuclear Group
Clive Smitton	-	Nuclear Consultant
Mr S Andrews	-	Trade Union Representative
Mr J Stanton	-	Stroud District Council
Ms C Jones	-	Welsh Assembly
Mr C Blackburn	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr M Johnson	-	Gloucestershire Harbour Trustees
Mr I Jarvis	-	National Waterways
Ms A Presdee	-	Gloucestershire First
Mr B Langdon	-	Welsh Water
Mr R Bartlam	-	Stinchcombe Parish Council
Ms V Watts	-	Berkeley Town Council

3 Formal thanks were conveyed to all those who had participated in the end state consultation. The good level of communications between the SSG subgroup and the Berkeley Site were noted.

II MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 1 NOVEMBER 2006

(a) Accuracy

4 The minutes of the meeting of the joint meeting held on 1 November 2006 were reviewed and deemed accurate.

III SITE MANAGERS REPORT – JIM CROCKER, SITE DIRECTOR

5 Mr Crocker began his report by describing a Lost Time Accident that had occurred on site.

6 Mr Crocker talked about the success of the partial site de-licensing that was achieved within tight timescales; he described this as major achievement for the site.

7 Mr Crocker highlighted that all site projects this year have run well, on schedule and on cost but mentioned that the major issue facing the site over the next 12 months was the funding restrictions placed on the site. The funding restrictions will have an effect on the number of projects being taken forward at site so this will mean a reduction in the number of both agency supplied workers and SLC staff. The site will follow the staff counselling procedure and where possible try to match business

requirements with staff aspirations and will involve trade unions. Emphasis throughout this time remains on keeping safe and compliant at all times.

IV PRESENTATION BY NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY – DR DAVID WARNER

- 8 Dr Warner expressed his thanks to the members of the SSG for their support in attending the meetings and for their participation in the end state consultation process overall.
- 9 Dr Warner spoke about the funding issues at Berkeley. He explained that the NDA funding comes from a mixture of income from commercial operations and “grant in aid” from the Government. There had been a drop in revenue from commercial operations and so this has resulted in a deficit in funding. This should not be mistaken as a funding cut. He went to say that the NDA had been in intensive negotiations with the Government with the aim of securing extra funding. The result being that some additional funding has been secured.
- 10 Dr Warner explained that Southern Region including Berkeley had been ‘hit’ worst because more of the work falls within the NDA Category 4 funding levels, i.e. work that can be stopped with no detriment to safety or regulatory compliance.
- 11 Dr Warner moved on to explain that funding is allocated as part of a comprehensive review that spans 3 years, and that discussions are ongoing with Government, for the 3 years beginning in April 2008 building on the agreement reached for 07/08.
- 12 Dr Warner explained about setting up two new Site Licence Companies (SLC’s). He explained that there would be lots of work involved in doing this and new ways of working. The timescales for completion of the formation of the 2 new SLC’s is during 2008.
- 13 Mr Howe asked if there is any funding available from the European Commission. Dr Warner responded no as this was a UK only issue.
- 14 Dr Hellen asked what were the timescales in terms of weeks or months for the decision on the future use of the delicensed part of site. Dr Warner responded by saying that work was still being undertaken by the consultants and the NDA would consider the findings from their report. There are some issues relating to planning status and the management of Berkeley Centre and these will be considered by the NDA when looking at the future of the Berkeley Centre.
- 15 Mr Howe asked in terms of the planning process, who will deal with it, District Council, the County Council or will it go to Public Enquiry. Dr Warner responded by saying that the NDA have a team of consultants dealing with this and they are aware of the relevant bodies.

V END STATE PRESENTATION BY DAVE FAUVER

- 16 Mr Fauver clarified between the red and green area on the aerial photograph, the red being the subject of the end state consultation.
- 17 Mr Fauver discussed that 3 possible end states had emerged from the consultation, these were;
Baseline - Excavate entire site to 1 m below grade Re-grade/backfill/seed
Open Natural - Same as baseline with natural landscape
Slab Remaining - Backfill all below grade structures to ground level and leave all slab and hard standing
- 18 Mr Fauver summarised the findings from the end state evaluation results and using a matrix within the presentation concluding that the baseline is the proposed end state as it provides the greatest flexibility to accommodate any future end use and also provides a reasonable positive/negative balance of the factors evaluated.
- Mr Lynden asked what will the value of the calculated saving of £3M be in 80 years from now when the reactors are decommissioned. Mr Fauver responded saying that the saving equates to 0.3% of the total cost of budget.
- 19 Mr Darymple-Smith asked will the 1m depth of soil excavated be contaminated waste. Mr Fauver's response was the soil would not be contaminated and approval for would be gained for its shipment from the appropriate Regulator. Mr Fauver also clarified that the 1m depth excavation relates to the foundations of the structures currently standing.
- 20 Mr Avery asked if the currently delicensed site is ready now, and could the end use affect the licensed area. Also, if the concrete slab that remains after final site clearance is structurally sound, could it be left in place for reuse. Mr Crocker said that no-one can predict the future but of course there would be flexibility on any decisions made.
- 21 Dr Hellen asked if there is a contingency plan in place for the sea level rising. Mr Crocker responded by saying that this has been considered and evaluated. The sea level will be monitored and the plan for the site reviewed periodically. If sea levels rise enough to present a problem in executing the plan then this would be dealt with by possibly accelerating the work.

VI INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WASTE STORE PRESENTATION BY STUART HOUSTON

- 22 Mr Houston gave a brief description of the BPM and BPEO processes used. The BPM evaluation criteria looks at various areas of site pegged against a list of criteria. A scoring system is used and this was visually represented within the presentation. The process uses very minute detail, and asks such questions as where and what sort of store and goes into detail about the portionality of work. The outcome of the BPM

evaluation is that the store should be situated on location N1 on the site. This location is 1m higher than other areas on the rest of the site which is in line with considerations of climate change and the potential for flooding. Mr Houston explained that the design on the Berkeley ILW store is based on the same design as Hinkley's ILW store.

- 23 Mr Baker asked about the location of the store and whether this is the most suitable location. He suggested it could be moved to the east of the site and therefore more in line with the existing reactor buildings reducing the visibility of the building on the landscape. Mr Houston responded to Mr Baker by saying that the location is right as it factors in the amount of space required to carry out works required during early reactor dismantlement. The chosen location known as N1 is also the highest point on the site. Mr Baker maintained that the position needs revising. Mr Houston reiterated that all areas have been considered on the site and the east location is 1.5M lower than N1.
- 24 Mr Howe requested the knowledge of how to get a copy of the full report. Mr Houston explained that a copy is available for £50 and upon request from the site.
- 25 Mr Howells asked if a breach in the EA defences has been considered given that low maintenance. He expressed his concern over the need for flood defences to be maintained. Mr Houston said that the floor level of the ILW store will be 11M above ordnance level and with regard to the sea defences, periodic safety reviews are held at the site and this is covered within these reviews.
- 26 Mr Withey, Environment Agency responded to the question concerning flood defences by explaining that there has been a large EA consultation and the findings are published within a report available on the Environment Agency's website.
- 27 Mr Crocker added to the comments by stating that the ILW Store at Berkeley is a temporary store until a national repository is built. The store is in no way a long term solution. Mr Crocker also explained that at a recent town council meeting in Lydney, the question was asked on why can't the waste remain in its current location at Berkeley (i.e. in the vaults) and only be moved when the national repository is built. Mr Crocker explained that the reasoning behind this is that the waste is untreated at present and that the real hazards are associated with the fact the waste is currently below the water table. Mr Crocker said that there is currently a 3 year lead time on building the store. Doing nothing is not an option.
- 28 Dr Hellen asked where the risk of flooding sits. Mr Crocker replied that the vaults have flooded before and the risk remains of it happening again. Storing the waste in the proposed ILW store reduces these risks of flooding in the future to a low level.
- 29 Mr Howells asked whether the ILW Store would be demolished once the national repository is built and waste transferred. He also raised the

question whether the store would be contaminated once the waste has been removed. Mr Crocker explained that the store will be demolished and there would be no contamination remaining.

- 30 Cllr Booth asked whether there will be any security presence at the site when the store is constructed and in operation. Mr Crocker's response was that there will be 24 hour security on the site during the care and maintenance phase. The Office of Civil Nuclear Security has the final approval on plans concerning security at Nuclear Sites.
- 31 Cllr ShenoI asked whether the final application will go to the Secretary of State as they have the ultimate authority. Dr Warner confirmed this would be a County Council matter.

V11 SIMON FORD, HYDER CONSULTING PRESENTATION

- 32 Mr Ford commenced his presentation by noting that the consultation report is available on the NDA website. Mr Ford explained about the information gained during the consultation was used to understand a number of key things such as basic demographic information. The consultations helped to establish a level of awareness of site matters and to gain an understanding of the views of the local residents on waste retention/ removal from site and what the views on range of end states (A, B, C1, C2, D1 & D2) as identified by the SSG were.
- 33 Mr Ford went into detail on the forms that the consultation took. These were, a doorstep survey of residents (523 residents within 5 miles), public exhibitions (Berkeley and Lydney), a postal survey of 55 stakeholder organisations and 2 stakeholder workshops (Berkeley & Coleford)
- 34 Mr Ford explained that following the consultation, some recommendations had been made; these were that the findings from the consultations should be fed back to the local community as soon as possible. A 'Question & Answer' document should be provided to stakeholders and the engagement of willing residents from the doorstep survey in future consultation exercises should be considered.
- 35 Mr Avery asked if the consultation was conducted 50/50 on both sides of the river and were more people concerned about regeneration on the Lydney side of the river. Mr Ford explained that the only statistically significant data was reported.
- 36 Mr Baker said that he thought that things appeared to be moving in circles with regards to the end state consultation and asked whether answers are dependent on how you pose the questions.
- 37 Mr Baker asked what was the NDA's preferred option and is this dependent on funding. Dr Warner responded by saying that this is a consultative process. The NDA now has to look at all the sites and

undertake a reconciliation process.

- 38 Avery said obviously development of the delicensed area of site is paramount and asked whether both sides of the site will affect each other ultimately. Mr Ford agreed that having two sites is confusing and during the consultative process people were told about the current plan. The questions asked what people want and it is understood that this might not be possible in the short term.
- 39 Cllr Wride added that it is reassuring that part of the site can be delicensed and that this is an important achievement.

V111 DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING

The next Berkeley SSG meeting will be held on the 15th May 2007 at the Berkeley Arms Hotel, Berkeley, Glos, commencing with a finger buffet at 18.00pm.