

MAGNOX ELECTRIC LTD

BERKELEY NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE AND OLDBURY ON SEVERN

POWER STATION SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT OLDBURY

ON WEDNESDAY 20 APRIL 2005

PRESENT:

Mr J Lamonby (in the chair)	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr M J Steele	-	Berkeley Nuclear Licensed Site
Mr J Beckett	-	Stroud District Council
Cllr B Booth	-	Gloucestershire County Council
Cllr D Burgess	-	Alkington Parish Council
Cllr E Ford	-	Rockhampton Parish Council
Mr D Gatehouse	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Cllr Dr K Graupner	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr M Hawkins	-	Aust Parish Council
Ms S Hutchison	-	NII
Mr J Lindsay	-	NII
Cllr M Lynden	-	Oldbury on Severn Parish Council
Cllr P Mair	-	Falfield Parish Council
Mr R Mrowicki	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Cllr Ms S O'Neill	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Mr M Pennington	-	Gloucestershire Police
Mr D Warner	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Ms J Wilson	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr R Winfield	-	National Farmers Union
Mr D Withey	-	Environment Agency
Cllr Ms P Wride	-	Ham and Stone Parish Council
Ms H Atkin	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms A Chapman	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr M Farley	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms R Lyon	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms S-A Beere	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr T Jones	-	Berkeley Centre
Mr S Payne	-	Berkeley Centre

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr M J Davis (Secretary)

I APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1 Mr Lamonby welcomed members to the meeting. He introduced himself as the Site Manager for Oldbury on Severn power station, recently appointed in succession to Mr J Vlietstra. He also introduced Mr Gatehouse, Mr Mrowicki, Mr Warner and Ms Wilson who were representing the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority which was now the owner of the Berkeley and Oldbury sites. Mr Lamonby extended a particular welcome to Cllr Hawkins who was attending a meeting of this group for the first time.

2 Apologies for absence were received from:

Mr S Kendrick	-	Avon Fire Brigade
Dr J Sarangi	-	Avon Health Authority
Cllr D Whitelock	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Mr David Drew MP		
Dr T Ejidokun	-	Gloucestershire Health Protection Unit
Mr L Davies	-	Health Protection Agency
Mr M Heaton	-	Oldbury Power Station
Mr D Webbe-Wood	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr S Conney	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr Dawson-Marsh	-	Lydney Town Council
Mr R Griffin	-	Dept of Trade and Industry

II MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 10 NOVEMBER 2004

(a) Accuracy

3 The minutes of the meeting of the Liaison Council held on 10 November 2004 were approved as a correct record.

(b) Matters arising

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

III LOCATION MANAGERS' REPORTS

(a) Oldbury on Severn power station

5 Mr Lamonby reported on operations at Oldbury on Severn Power Station since the date of the previous meeting. He said that Reactor 2 had been in continuous operation since that time and that electricity production for the financial year had been some 2TWh (thousand million units). This production had been in excess of target and the number of flasks of irradiated fuel despatched from site had also been greater than target; over 62 tonnes of fuel had been despatched from the site during the year. Mr Lamonby said that Reactor 2 was due to be shut down for a programme of inspections and maintenance work on 5 June; this programme was scheduled to last 60 days.

6 Mr Lamonby said that Reactor 1 remained shut down pending completion of maintenance work on the turbine. Machining was being carried out on the turbine shaft to remove minor defect indications. The necessary consent for start-up of the Reactor had been received from the NII and Mr Lamonby anticipated that a safety case justifying the return to service of the turbo alternator would be completed in the next two weeks.

7 Mr Lamonby said that it had been over 230 days since the last accident on the Oldbury site resulting in time lost from work and the station had received a Gold Award from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents. He said that the station was making good progress with implementation of a behavioural safety programme which encouraged observation of work tasks as a means of highlighting safe work practices.

8 Mr Lamonby referred to recent press coverage of the transport of a spare transformer to the site from Sharpness docks. This had been the final leg of a complex journey for this very large load and Mr Lamonby expressed his thanks to all those involved and those who might have been inconvenienced by the large transporter.

9 Mr Lamonby explained that the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority had been established on 1 April 2005 and British Nuclear Group was now managing the site as a contractor on behalf of the NDA. The current contract relating to Oldbury would last for two years and the fee receivable under the contract was based upon various aspects of performance. The NDA had indicated that they would introduce competition for these contracts in the future.

10 Mr Lamonby said that an application had been made to the Environment Agency for its consent to continued operation of the silt lagoon. He referred to the station's modest programme of sponsorship and support for local community activities. He pointed out that the Visitors Centre was to be renamed as the Information Centre and would provide information on the station's plans for electricity production over the next four years.

Berkeley Nuclear Licensed Site

11 Mr Steele reported on activities at the Berkeley Nuclear Licensed Site since the previous meeting of this Council. He pointed out that with effect from 1 April 2005 the site had been relicensed to Magnox Electric Ltd.

12 Describing operational activities during the past year, Mr Steele said that some work continued to be done at Berkeley in support of the graphite integrity safety cases for the operating stations. This work, on relatively low activity materials, would continue for some three months. Work on the decommissioning of the high active facilities was commencing as confirmation was received that the work previously carried out in these facilities had been transferred satisfactorily to Sellafield. Other work was continuing on cleaning and deplanting various chemical laboratories on site and preparatory work was in hand for the retrieval and encapsulation of intermediate level waste from the storage vaults on the power station site. Mr Steele said that progress on the power station site was consistent with the plan to have the site fully in a care and maintenance state by 2009.

13 Mr Steele said that there had been six accidents involving time lost from work by staff at Berkeley during the past year. Some of these had involved road traffic accidents while travelling to other sites and others had involved simple accidents such as slips, trips and falls. This situation was taken seriously and efforts were being made to improve performance and reduce the number of accidents. Mr Steele said that radiation exposures of personnel on site were extremely low.

14 Mr Steele said that with the planned closures of operating power stations the requirement for support services from staff located at Berkeley was reducing. It was anticipated that by the end of 2006 there would be some 250 staff remaining on site, approximately 130 of these would be involved in the clean-up and decommissioning work. Mr Steele said that over the past year a task force had been reviewing options for the future use of the Berkeley site. The task force had concluded that the facilities on part of the site might be used as a business park; it was hoped that this might be attractive to businesses in the energy generation and conservation industries, thus retaining the site's long standing link with the energy industry.

15 Mr Steele said that some staff reductions had taken place over the past year and others would follow over future months. All proposals for staff reductions were subject to the controls of the management of change procedure. Mr Steele said that the Near Term Work Plan for the site had been published; he welcomed any comments which members might wish to make and offered to provide further details if required.

16 Mr Gatehouse, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority's Site Programme Manager at Oldbury, described the role and organisation of the NDA. He referred to the importance

attached to providing greater transparency and making more information available to the public. He emphasised also the strong focus on safety, environmental issues and efficiency. He explained the intention to introduce competition to the management contracts for half of the NDA sites by the end of 2008.

17 In response to a question from Cllr Lynden, Mr Mrowicki explained that the NDA was responsible for civil public sector nuclear facilities; privately owned and defence facilities were outside of the NDA's remit. In response to a further question from Cllr Hawkins, Mr Mrowicki said that the NDA had no role to play in relation to the planning or establishment of new nuclear power generation facilities.

IV REPORTS FROM CHAIRMEN OF EMERGENCY PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

Oldbury-on-Severn power station

18 Ms Chapman reported on the meeting of the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee for Oldbury which had been held on 3 March 2005. She said that the meeting had reviewed the lessons learned from the exercise of the station's emergency arrangements carried out in October 2004; the exercise had focused particularly on arrangements for casualty handling and rescue. A further exercise to test the off-site elements of the emergency plan had been carried out in November. Both of these exercises had been considered by the NII to be a satisfactory demonstration of the emergency arrangements. Ms Chapman pointed out that further exercises were undertaken to test and demonstrate security procedures and environmental protection arrangements.

Berkeley Nuclear Licensed Site

19 Mr Steele reported on the meeting of the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee for the Berkeley site which had taken place on the morning prior to this meeting. It had been reported at the meeting that following a demonstration exercise which had been to the satisfaction of the NII, revised emergency arrangements had been implemented on 1 March 2005. These revised arrangements were appropriate to the much reduced potential hazard on the decommissioning site. Mr Steele said he anticipated that at some time in the future the emergency arrangements for the site would be simplified further when the REPPIR regulations were no longer applicable.

V NII SITE INSPECTORS' REPORTS

20 Ms Hutchison and Mr Lindsay reported on their inspection activities at Berkeley and Oldbury respectively. The following points were noted during discussion:

- (i) Ms Hutchison confirmed the NII's approval of the revised Emergency Plan for the Berkeley site commensurate with the reduced potential hazard on site.
- (ii) A considerable amount of regulatory activity in recent months had been associated with relicensing the sites to Magnox Electric Ltd as a consequence of BNFL organisational changes. The management of change procedure required by Site Licence Condition 36 was applied to all organisational changes.
- (iii) The NII was monitoring the progress of work on Oldbury Unit 1 turbo alternator and in due course would consider a safety case for its return to service.
- (iv) The NII had concluded that a satisfactory safety case had been made for returning Reactor 1 to service and had given the necessary consent during January 2005; the

reactor remained out of service pending completion of work on the turbo alternator. The forthcoming outage of Reactor 2 would contain a programme of inspection and sampling of reactor core graphite.

- (v) The Level 1 and Level 2 exercises at Oldbury had demonstrated the emergency arrangements adequately with both exercises providing examples of good practice.
- (vi) The NII had worked closely with the NDA during the transition to the current organisational arrangements. The role of the NII remained unchanged.

21 Mr Withey said that there were no significant issues arising from his regulatory activities on behalf of the Environment Agency at either the Oldbury or the Berkeley site.

22 In reply to a question from Mr Winfield on sea defences and the possibility of "managed retreat" in some areas, Cllr Booth, who served on a Flood Defence Committee, explained the position on a current review of flood defences in the area.

VI REPORT FROM LCLC REFOM SUB-GROUP

23 Cllr Lynden reported on the progress of discussions within the LCLC Reform Sub Group leading to the preparation of a proposed constitution. He outlined the main features of the proposals and the following points were noted during discussion:

- (i) The intention was to establish an independent local community based group to address site-related issues. The intention was to be open and transparent and to be accessible to communities.
- (ii) The Sub Group had concluded that the Oldbury and Berkeley sites should each have their separate Stakeholder Groups with joint meetings of the two groups as necessary to address common issues.
- (iii) Nominations to serve as Chairman and Vice-chairman of the proposed two Site Stakeholder Groups were as follows:

Oldbury: Chairman Cllr Lynden
 Vice-chairman Cllr Hawkins

Berkeley: Chairman Cllr Ms Wride
 Vice-chairman No nomination received

- (iv) Cllr Lynden suggested that it was necessary for each of the Groups to review its own membership. He felt that the Groups should take action to ensure that the local public was aware of their existence and their activities.
- (v) Cllr Burgess felt that Alkington and perhaps other parish councils would wish to be represented on both Groups.
- (vi) Cllr Booth, who had been a member of the LCLC and its predecessor for many years, did not support the proposal to split into separate Groups for the two sites. He said that even with the current frequency of meetings some parish councils appeared unable to send representatives to attend regularly. He questioned whether they would attend meetings held more frequently, particularly if they wished to be represented on both Groups. He believed that it was not necessary to have four meetings per year and that two meetings per year as at present was adequate.

- (vii) In relation to the proposal to have an independent Chairman, Cllr Booth said that the Site Managers who had chaired meetings in the past had always acted courteously and had met all requests for information in an open and straightforward manner.
- (viii) Cllr Booth said that if there were to be separate Groups for the two sites he believed that Gloucestershire County Council should be represented on both Groups.
- (ix) Mr Mrowicki commented that the proposals which had been prepared were consistent with the NDA guidance but were still in draft form and could be developed further in the light of experience. He said he believed that the proposed arrangements reflected the needs of the local communities.
- (x) Ms Atkins said that separate discussions on representation on these Groups from the Forest of Dean were taking place with Cllr Shenoï who had been unable to attend this meeting.
- (xi) Mr Winfield, who also had attended these meetings for many years, commented that a joint meeting covering both sites had proved to be adequate when both sites were in full operation and he questioned whether separate Groups were justified at this stage. He felt that separate arrangements for the two sites would simply proliferate the number of meetings.
- (xii) Cllr Hawkins expressed support for the proposal to have separate meetings for the two sites with joint meetings as necessary when there was common business to discuss. Cllr Ms O'Neill believed that the proposals would allow local residents who held anti-nuclear views to attend meetings and receive direct responses to questions they wished to raise.
- (xiii) Mr Lamonby said he wished to see meetings well attended and he hoped that separate arrangements for the two sites would not lead to a reduction in numbers attending.

24 Following this exchange of views between members Mr Lamonby said he believed it was appropriate at this stage to accept the recommendations of the Sub Group and to proceed on the basis of separate Stakeholder Groups for the Oldbury and Berkeley sites with joint meetings being held when appropriate. The meeting to be held in the coming autumn would be a joint meeting at which environmental monitoring reports would be received and it would be possible at that time to review the revised arrangements and make any necessary changes. Mr Lamonby therefore proposed that the recommendations of the Sub Group should be accepted and members supported this proposal.

VII ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No business

VIII DATE TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed.

MJD
28 April 2005