

**BERKELEY NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE AND OLDBURY ON SEVERN
POWER STATION SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUPS
MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING HELD AT CATTLE COUNTRY,
BERKELEY ON TUESDAY 16 OCTOBER 2007**

PRESENT:

Cllr Mrs P Wride (in the chair)	-	Ham and Stone Parish Council
Cllr M Lynden	-	Oldbury on Severn Parish Council
Cllr D Burgess	-	Alkington Parish Council
Cllr N Cooper	-	Stroud District Council
Cllr M Hawkins	-	Aust Parish Council
Cllr M Kirby	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Cllr Mrs J Lyons	-	Olveston Parish Council
Cllr Mrs S O'Neill	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Rev D Primrose	-	Oldbury Power Station Chaplain
Cllr V Shenoi	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Cllr Mrs V Tutin	-	Olveston Parish Council
Cllr Ms V Watts	-	Berkeley Town Council
Cllr J Whitney	-	Falfield Parish Council
Cllr D Wride	-	Stroud District Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr S Barker	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Dr D Warner	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr D Atkinson	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr R Flynn	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr J Dalton	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr J Beckett	-	Stroud District Council
Mr A Hockin	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Mr R Hopes	-	Avon and Somerset Constabulary
Mr M Langdon	-	Lower Severn Drainage Board
Mr J Lindsay	-	NII
Mr A Funnell	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr K Andam	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr M Pennington	-	Gloucestershire Police
Mr D Withey	-	Environment Agency
Dr P Mountford-Lister	-	Environment Agency
Mr J Lamonby	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr J C Bishton	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr P Clarke	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms S Postans	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms E Vaughan Lewis	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr D Billing	-	EHSQ Site Inspector
Mr J Crocker	-	Berkeley Licensed Site
Mr S Barnett	-	Berkeley Licensed Site
Ms N Carter	-	Berkeley Licensed Site
Mr D Morgan	-	Berkeley Licensed Site
Mr S Payne	-	Berkeley Licensed Site
Dr C Chudley	-	

Mr W R Cullimore
Mr R Dalrymple-Smith
Mr B Delve
Mr W Gill
Mr R Hellen
Mr N Carmichael
Mr T Holmes
Mr M J Davis (Secretary)

I WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

1 Cllr Mrs Wride welcomed members of the Oldbury and Berkeley Site Stakeholder Groups to the meeting which was being held jointly for the consideration of monitoring reports and other items of interest to both SSGs.

II APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 Apologies for absence were received from Mr J Cripps, Dr C Smitton, Mr D Drew, Mr M Harper, Mr F Baker, Mr A Jardine, Ms C Humble, Cllr T Archer, Mr J Close, Cllr C Evers, Cllr G Langdon, Ms M Morrey, Mr D Webbe-Wood, Mr B Archer, Mr J Gilliland, Mr A Pinder, Cllr R Unwin, Mr B S Kirk, Cllr G Locke, Cllr K Graupner, Mr A Murdoch, Mr G Laverack, Cllr M Riddle, Mr R Phillips, Ms A Kerrigan and Dr L Hales.

III MINUTES OF THE JOINT MEETING HELD ON 1 NOVEMBER 2006

(a) Accuracy

3 The minutes of the meeting of the joint meeting held on 1 November 2006 were approved as a correct record.

(b) Matters arising

4 There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

IV PUBLIC FORUM

5 There were no issues raised by members of the public.

V ITEMS OF JOINT INTEREST

(a) Radiological Waste

6 Mr Dalton explained the background to the current consultation on proposals for the management of radioactive waste. He reminded members that the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) had reported to government in July 2006; its principal recommendation had been for deep geological disposal of wastes. As implementation of that policy would take some time, interim storage arrangements were needed. In relation to the

selection of sites it had been suggested that communities might volunteer to host disposal facilities.

7 Mr Dalton said that throughout the world there were some 39 countries with significant arisings of radioactive wastes; most had taken decisions that geological disposal was the preferred arrangement for managing these wastes and were in various stages of developing facilities. No country had considered it appropriate to pursue a policy of indefinite storage of the waste.

8 Mr Dalton said that as part of its response to the CoRWM recommendations government had set out proposals for managing radioactive wastes safely and implementing deep geological disposal. The proposals were currently the subject of public consultation and the deadline for submitting comments was 2 November 2007. Mr Dalton outlined some of the issues set out in the consultation document and encouraged members to submit their views.

9 During discussion Rev Primrose asked what was meant by "local" in relation to communities which might volunteer to host facilities. Mr Dalton so that this was one of the issues on which views were welcomed in the consultation. He said that the government intended to issue a White Paper next year taking account of comments raised in the consultation.

10 In response to a question on the volumes of wastes, Mr Dalton said that there were some 500,000 cubic metres of these wastes accumulated in the UK. This compared with a volume of some 4 million tonnes of household waste produced each year. Cllr Lynden suggested that in relation to the regulation of these matters some international scrutiny might be helpful in demonstrating an impartial approach.

11 Cllr Mrs Wride and Cllr Lynden agreed that they would make arrangements for a meeting of members to formulate comments which could be submitted as part of the public consultation.

(b) NDA Update

12 Dr Warner reported on current NDA issues, drawing particular attention to the following:

- (i) In the light of additional work being found to be required at many sites it had been necessary to identify work which could be deferred in order to fund higher priority work. A decision had been taken recently to defer work at Berkeley on the ILW waste vault retrieval project and the construction of the ILW storage facility. Decisions had not yet been taken on the length of time over which this work would be deferred; this would be the subject of further discussions between the NDA and the site licence company.
- (ii) Details of the funding to be made available to the NDA as part of the government's Comprehensive Spending Review had not yet

been announced. The NDA proposals set out in its business plan would be published during November.

- (iii) The introduction of competition for the management of the low level waste disposal facility near Drigg was in its final stages with negotiations taking place with the preferred bidder. Dialogue was taking place with four potential bidders in relation to competition for management of the Sellafield site. Arrangements for the competition for the Magnox South group of sites were currently on hold.
- (iv) The NDA's Annual Report and Accounts had been published. During the past year work valued at more than £2 billion had been undertaken by the NDA's contractors. Improvements and savings had resulted in a net efficiency gain of 3% on contracted work programmes. Income from commercial operations was £1.2 billion which was some £112 million less than budget due largely to the continued lack of availability of the THORP plant. Electricity generation had been above target but income derived from this had been £13 million less than budget due to price variations. The cost of the overall nuclear liability had risen to a current estimate of £37 billion (discounted money); this compared with the estimate of £31 billion in the previous year.
- (v) The NDA's Annual Health and Safety report was available on the website.

13 During discussion the following points were noted:

- (i) In response to a question from Cllr Ms Watts on the decision to defer construction of the ILW Store, Dr Warner emphasised that safety remained the highest priority. He said that the deferral of work on the project was conditional upon the ability to prepare a safety case for allowing wastes to remain in existing facilities. The safety case would have to be assessed to the satisfaction of the regulators.
- (ii) Rev Primrose drew attention to the fact that additional work had been identified at all sites and the estimate of the overall value of the nuclear liability had increased significantly. He felt that this could lead to some anxiety amongst the public. Dr Warner said that in any engineering work there would always be some unplanned work for example to cover breakdowns etc which could not be foreseen. He said that if extra contingency sums were to be included in budgets this would sterilise funds which could be used for further work. He said that some increases were to be expected as detailed plans removed uncertainties but he drew attention to the effect of major strategic issues on the estimated value of the overall nuclear liability.

- (iii) In response to a further question, Dr Warner said that the THORP plant was currently being brought back into service.

(c) Update on Berkeley ILW Store

14 Mr Crocker explained the impact of the decision to defer the construction of the ILW Store. He said that the preliminary work which had been started would be continued to take the project to a logical point at which it could be left and then subsequently re-started. Detailed plans would be made for closing down and subsequently re-starting the project. In response to a question from Cllr Wride he said that these plans would ensure that current knowledge of the plant and the project was retrievable.

(d) NII Site Licence Terminology

15 In response to a request at the previous meeting of the Oldbury SSG, Mr Lindsay explained the various terminology used in relation to the NII's regulation of nuclear sites. He explained that under the requirements of the Nuclear Installations Act, a licence was required for certain nuclear activities, including the operation of a civil nuclear power station. The Act gave the NII the power to attach conditions to the licence. These conditions were equivalent to Regulations and the breach of a Site Licence Condition was a criminal offence. Mr Lindsay said that there were 36 Site Licence Conditions covering the whole range of aspects of the management, control, operation and maintenance activities on the site.

16 Mr Lindsay explained that Licence Conditions gave the NII primary (direct) powers to "approve, specify, direct, consent, notify or agree" certain matters and secondary (indirect) powers through processes defined in the site's own management systems. These various terms had particular meanings and Mr Lindsay gave examples of the powers covered by each of the terms. He explained that in exercising these powers the NII had a responsibility to understand the operations on the sites and work closely with the licensees to ensure that regulation was fair and that key safety issues were understood and properly addressed.

17 During discussion Rev Primrose questioned whether the NII had the resources necessary to fulfil its functions, having regard for the inordinate delays in clearing safety issues and the major financial implications of those delays. Mr Lindsay acknowledged that there were resource constraints which required care to be exercised in allocating resources; external resources were used where appropriate. Mr Lindsay said that action was being taking in relation to recruitment, having regard for additional work associated with potential new station construction.

18 Cllr Shenoï felt that the NII faced the same problem as the operators and the NDA in retaining skills and knowledge which might not be required until a new generation of power stations was built. Mr Lindsay and Dr Warner described actions which were being taken to enable the required skills to be maintained.

19 Mr Lindsay pointed out that details of Site Licence Conditions and guidance to Site Inspectors were available on the HSE website.

VI ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING

(a) Food Standards Agency

20 Mr Funnell reported on the results of the monitoring of radioactivity in food and the environment undertaken during 2006 by the Food Standards Agency and the Environment Agency. The formal report on the results of this monitoring would be published during November and copies would be made available for members.

21 Mr Funnell explained the nature of the monitoring undertaken and the way in which the results were used to assess the potential radiation exposures which might be received by members of the public in the vicinity of the sites consuming locally produced foodstuffs. He said that the potential dose to a member of the public in the vicinity of the Berkeley and Oldbury sites consuming locally produced foodstuffs during 2006 was assessed as less than 5 microSieverts (μSv) and the potential dose which might have been received by a member of the local fishing community consuming locally caught fish and shellfish was $12\mu\text{Sv}$. He said that this potential exposure was small compared with the annual dose limit of $1000\mu\text{Sv}$ for members of the public from artificial sources of radioactivity (excluding medical treatments) and the average annual UK exposure from all natural sources which was more than $2200\mu\text{Sv}$. The exposure associated with a dental X-ray was $5\mu\text{Sv}$ and the exposure from cosmic radiation during a return flight between the UK and Australia was $160\mu\text{Sv}$.

22 In reply to questions Mr Funnell confirmed that the assessed exposures in the vicinity of the Berkeley and Oldbury sites were comparable with those around other nuclear power station sites; the assessed exposure around Sellafield from aquatic sources was $240\mu\text{Sv}$. Mr Hellen asked whether the monitoring gave any indication of trends resulting from changed operations on the site. Mr Funnell said that the monitoring results were broadly similar to those in previous years. Mr Withey said that in relation to another site in South Wales the effects of operational decisions to withhold discharges pending a review of operational practices had been apparent in the past.

23 In reply to further questions on the effects of plant shutdowns at Oldbury during the past year Mr Clark said that there would have been little impact on the aquatic environment as the fuel route had remained in service throughout the period. Reduced operation of the reactor would have resulted in reduced gaseous discharges but the impact of these discharges on the environment was so small that the changes would not be readily discernible.

(b) Magnox Electric Ltd

24 Mr Clark reviewed the results of the environmental monitoring undertaken by Magnox Electric during the past year. He said that as a result of the extended shutdown of the Oldbury reactors gaseous discharges to the atmosphere had been less than in previous years. He said that the results of the station's monitoring were similar to those reported by the Food Standards Agency and there were no apparent trends from previous years. He said that in relation to the terrestrial monitoring undertaken it was difficult to see any effects of the sites' operation on the environment. This was confirmed by radiation dose rate measurements which were taken at different distances from the sites and which showed no significant changes with distance from the site.

25 In response to a question from Cllr Hawkins on the potential effects of construction of a barrage, Mr Clark said that the site had an obligation to use best practicable means to ensure the best dispersion of discharges in order to minimise any dose impact.

(c) Environment Agency

26 Mr Withey reported briefly on the Environment Agency's regulatory activities in relation to the Berkeley and Oldbury sites. He referred specifically to the monitoring of discharges and to the regulatory work associated with the division of Magnox Electric into Magnox South and Magnox North.

VII DATE TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT JOINT MEETING

27 It was noted that the next joint meeting to be held in November 2008 would be hosted by Oldbury. The date and venue would be confirmed in due course.

MJD

19 October 2007