

HINKLEY POINT SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held at the Decommissioning Skills Centre, Cannington Centre
on Friday 22 February 2008.

Present

<u>Cllr M Short (Chairman)</u>	-	Fiddington Parish Council
Mr N Cann	-	Station Director, Hinkley Point B
Mr T Watkins	-	Deputy Site Director, Hinkley Point A Site

Elected Members

Cllr C Allen	-	Cannington Parish Council
<u>Mrs J Brown</u>	-	Parents Concerned About Hinkley
<u>Mr M Brown</u>	-	Otterhampton Parish Council
<u>Mr A Debenham</u>	-	Stop Hinkley
Mr A Downes	-	Bridgwater Town Council
<u>Mr J Edney</u>	-	Somerset County Council
<u>Cllr A Fraser</u>	-	Sedgemoor District Council
Mr C Graham	-	Sedgemoor & West Somerset Green Party
<u>Cllr D Hill</u>	-	Sedgemoor District Council
<u>Cllr Dr M Kellaway-Marriott</u>	-	North Somerset District Council
Mr C Knox	-	National Farmers Union
<u>Cllr C Morgan</u>	-	West Somerset Council
Ms L Scott	-	Forum 21
Mr B Slade	-	Stogursey Parish Council
Mr M Treharne	-	Friends of Quantock
Cllr A Trollope-Bellew	-	Somerset County Council
<u>Cllr T Williams</u>	-	Kilve Parish Council

Appointed Members

Mr M Brooks	-	Environmental Health Officer – Sedgemoor
Mr R Davies	-	Emergency Planning, Somerset Local Authority
Mr A Dyer	-	West Somerset Council
Mr D Haigh	-	Government Office South West – Resilience Team
<u>Mr G Hudd</u>	-	Somerset County Council
Mr A Murray	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Mr G Roberts	-	Environment Agency – B Station
Mr P Smith	-	NII - B Station Inspector
Mr D Withey	-	Environment Agency – A Station

Co-opted members

<u>Cllr B Child</u>	-	Co-opted Member
----------------------------	---	-----------------

NDA

David Warner	-	NDA Programme Manager- Magnox South
--------------	---	-------------------------------------

British Energy

Mr M Haslett	-	Environmental Safety Group Head
Mr D Stokes	-	Human Resources Advisor
Mr M Townsend	-	SRD Site Inspector – British Energy.

Magnox South

Mr R Adcock	-	Head of Environment – Magnox South
Mr J Darke	-	Deputy Assistant Site Manager – Magnox South
Mr D Gutteridge	-	EHS&Q Inspector – Magnox South
Mr T Jones	-	Head of Communications – Magnox South
Mr S Kenney	-	ILW Project Engineer - Magnox South
Dr A Meehan	-	Technical Integrator – Magnox South
Mrs S Stewart (Secretary)	-	Communication Officer
Mr C Thomson	-	Magnox South Union Representative

In Attendance

Ms K Attwater	-	Member of the Public
Mr A Ball	-	Magnox South
Miss G Coombs	-	Magnox South
Mr J Freeman	-	Member of the Public
Ms Harvey-Smith	-	Member of the Public
Mrs J Hellier	-	Magnox South
Mr M Hogg	-	Member of the Public
Mr T Meek	-	Magnox South

Members of the sub group are highlighted above in bold and underlined. Appendix 1 shows the full sub group list.

1. OPEN PUBLIC Q & A SESSION.

The Chairman opened the meeting and invited questions from members of the public. There were no questions during this session.

2. CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from: G Bell, M Caswell, B Copp, N Hercock, P Higginson, A Horsfall, J Pinkard and D Webbe-Wood.

The Chairman pointed out that Mr Copp is the new Site Director for the A Site. Unfortunately he was unable to attend the meeting. Tim Watkins, Deputy Site Director presented the A Site report in Mr Copps absence.

The following new member introduced himself at the request of the Chairman:

Malcolm Hogg – Nether Stowey.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 OCTOBER 2007

a) Accuracy

The minutes of the meeting of this group held on 16 March 2007 were approved as a correct record of the meeting.

b) Matters Arising from Minutes of the meeting on 19 October 2007

Item 2b.6 – Distribution of Potassium Iodate tablets in Stockland Bristol:

Mr Higginson will be attending the Stockland Bristol Annual Parish meeting on 19 March to discuss Potassium Iodate tablets. Mr T Hurry of Somerset Council Civil Contingency Unit will also be attending this meeting.

Item 2b.9 – Induction Training for SSG members:

A successful session of induction training took place on 29 November 2007. The second session planned for 9 January 2008 did not attract enough interest to run. The Chairman explained that the idea of the induction course is to give people a better appreciation of the operation of each site. Another session will be arranged in the near future if enough interest is shown. Anyone wanting to attend should register their interest with the secretary. A minimum of six people would need to attend each course to make the sessions viable.

Item 11. B Station contribution to the SSG meetings

At the last meeting, the chairman asked British Energy if they would consider a financial contribution towards the running of the SSG. Under the present arrangements, the chairman can claim a reimbursement for any meetings attended throughout the year when representing the group, however the vice chair, who, under the existing arrangements would be seen as the successor to the chair, does not have this arrangement. He asked Mr Cann if British Energy had given any more thought to this. Mr Cann said that this issue is currently undergoing a corporate review. A recommendation is likely to go to the company secretary. It is expected that an outcome will be known by the next SSG meeting in June 2008.

Item 11. SSG Sub Group

At the last meeting, it was suggested that the Low Level Waste Sub Group would also meet to agree the agenda of SSG meetings and any other issues that need to be formally addressed between the main meetings. A list of the sub group will be circulated with these minutes.

Following the decision to increase the number of SSG meetings to three per year, the sub group agreed that it would be sensible to agree that the meetings take place on the last Friday of February, June and October. This would make it easier to plan future dates in members diary's. Therefore the two remaining meetings for this year will take place on 27 June and 31 October.

The chairman said he had missed one item when preparing the matters arising for the meeting. At the last meeting, Mr Lesinski had agreed to take away an action to report back to the SSG on average dose rates to operators in the ponds. Mr Watkins explained that the figures were very complex and asked Mr Meek, EHS&Q Manager, to update the meeting. Mr Meek explained that the average dose rates in R1 Ponds were 20 – 30 μ Sv per hour, R2 figures were lower at around 10 μ Sv per hour. These differences are partly due to operating history but also due to the fact that pond furniture has been removed from the R2 ponds. Mr Watkins explained that the figures were available to anyone that wanted them. Members of the SSG should register their interest with the secretary.

Mr Edney asked if the doses that the ponds workers were receiving were below the acceptable safety levels. Mr Watkins assured the meeting that the doses were significantly below the acceptable levels. Mr Meek explained that the amount of mSv a worker is allowed to receive in a year is around 20, the workers in the ponds are receiving under 4 mSv per year.

4. STATION DIRECTORS REPORT – HINKLEY POINT B STATION

- (i) Mr Cann explained that on the 11 December, British Energy had announced a five year life extension for Hinkley Point B and Hunterston B. He said that he would talk about this in more detail later in the report.

- (ii) British Energy staff have gone 437 days without a lost time accident. Unfortunately two of British Energy's contract partners have had lost time accidents since the last SSG meeting. These were both fairly minor. One resulted in a hand injury and other one resulted in an injury to a workers heel. British Energy are working with Tarmac Concrete Products and Shell UK, who both have impressive industrial safety records, in an attempt to improve industrial safety at the site.
- (iii) There have been no environmental events or INES (International Nuclear Event Scale) reportable events since the last SSG meeting.
- (iv) Both units have been operating safely on load since the last meeting and recorded record runs. This reflects the significant amount of investment the company has put into the plant.
- (v) Hinkley Point B Station staff along with their contract partners have raised over £12,000 for St Margarets Hospice in Taunton much of which has been match funded pound for pound by British Energy.
- (vi) The station continues to employ 538 full time BE staff and 208 contract partner staff. They also employ 17 apprentices and intend to employ more apprentices again this year.
- (vii) On 27 November 2007, British Energy announced that it had commissioned a range of geological, environmental impact, marine and transmission surveys in preparation of any potential new build or replacement nuclear.
- (viii) Mr Cann explained that prior to the announcement of the life extension of Hinkley Point B Station and Hunterston B Station, a rigorous technical and economical assessment was carried out following a successful periodic safety review where agreement was given from the regulator that subject to an agreed programme of work, British Energy would not need to do another periodic safety review until 2017. The regulators will continue to monitor that programme of work. Mr Cann explained that the company would continue to monitor the boiler tubes and the graphite core.

Questions relating to the B Station Report:

The Chairman explained that although British Energy had taken the decision to extend the life of Hinkley Point B Station, operation will still depend on the regulators being happy with the safety case.

Mr Williams asked what the percentage of cracks in the graphite would need to be to stop operation of the station. Mr Cann explained that it would depend on where the cracks were. He explained that monitoring and inspection of the graphite considers the most extreme event, i.e. an earth quake. If analysis of this work showed any problems, British Energy would take the decision to shut down the plant.

Mrs Brown mentioned the NII report from Jun – Sep 2007 and a reference to the Graphite Core Safety Case. She asked under what circumstances the NII would shut down the reactors. Mr Cann explained that there were some concerns about some calculations that were done when measuring the effects of irradiation embrittlement on the core restraints. British Energy had immediately set the most conservative position. He assured the meeting that monitoring work was ongoing. The chairman and the B Station NII Inspector agreed that they would cover this subject in more detail under the NII agenda item.

Mr Graham mentioned that the B Station report seemed to have a different emphasis than that of the

NII report on the subject of the core. He asked how many bricks were affected at this stage. Mr Cann said that it was 0.1% of the bricks that were shown to be affected. Mr Cann said there was no embrittlement of the graphite core. He didn't agree that there was a big difference between the station report and the NII report.

Mr Brown commented that the announcement of the extension of B Station seemed like good news. Mr Cann said that obviously it would mean continued employment until 2016.

Mr Debenham referred to the British Energy brief issued to SSG members about the Graphite Core Restraint Safety Case. He asked Mr Cann if he could give some more information about the feasibility study of inspecting the core restraint rods and also the outcome of the review to determine the final position and numbers of channels to be inspected. He also asked if the safety justification for continued operation of the reactors had been approved by the NII. Mr Cann explained that two outages were planned. These outages would look at the boiler tubes and the graphite core. The plan is to get remote access to inspect the core restraints. A programme of work is being put together to carry out more core restraint inspections than previously carried out. A remote inspection rig is planned for future outages which will allow more detailed inspections and cut down the need to double handle fuel.

Mr Debenham asked if the 70% load restrictions were being reviewed. Mr Cann explained that the company are continuing to monitor the situation, the reduced temperatures obviously reduce the stress on the boiler tubes. After the next two outages have been completed, the company will review the situation.

Mr Debenham asked a question relating to the governments decision to open the door to new nuclear build. As the government has not offered any economic incentives to new build projects he wondered what benefits British Energy saw to becoming involved in new build. Mr Cann confirmed that they had publicly announced that they were looking for partners with an interest in potential new build and that some surveys were being carried out. He said that British Energy would announce which companies they were likely to partner with in the near future however the subject of new build was probably too big an issue to discuss at this SSG meeting.

The chairman agreed with Mr Cann and said that the SSG's role was to discuss issues around the operation of Hinkley Point B Station and the decommissioning of Hinkley Point A Site. The agenda for the current meeting had been set and the group should to stick to their remit.

Dr Kellaway-Marriott commented that the reference in the B Station report about the station saving around 140 million tonnes of CO₂ from entering the atmosphere, was an important point to bear in mind. He was also pleased to hear that B Station had chosen a local company with regard to consulting about lost time accident figures. He thanked Mr Cann for publishing the nature trail warden's email address in the British Energy magazine.

5. SITE DIRECTORS REPORT – HINKLEY POINT A SITE

- (i) Mr Watkins introduced himself as the deputy site director for Hinkley Point A Site and explained that he was new to the Site Stakeholder Group meetings. He explained that he would pick out a few points from the report and answer questions at the end.
- (ii) On the conventional side of decommissioning, the site has accelerated the removal and demolition of some redundant pipe-bridges. The site is also about to remove the spoil which was temporarily stored on the C Site land back on site to fill some voids that have been created.

- (iii) The site still intends to apply for planning for a Low Level Waste (LLW) disposal facility on site. Dr Meehan would be giving a presentation on this subject later in the meeting.
- (iv) The site has now processed over 500 skips. So far over 352 skips have been sent to the US for smelting.
- (v) A lot of work is being done on site to look at ways of retrieving and processing solid intermediate level waste and wet intermediate level waste. This will be discussed in more detail later in the meeting.
- (vi) The site has been issued ISO 9001 and 14001 along with OHSAS 18001 accreditation. To achieve this accreditation the site had to be audited for safety, environment, quality and occupational health at the site.
- (vii) The site successfully demonstrated its annual Level One Emergency Exercise on 7 November 2007.
- (viii) A new mock up training facility was recently commissioned on site. This facility allows people to train on full scale replicas of common work areas.
- (ix) The site has now gone for 221 days without a lost time accident.
- (x) On company matters, Magnox South, has now entered a period of shadow working. Magnox North and Magnox South have to demonstrate that they can operate as two separate companies moving towards legal separation in the future.
- (xi) Hinkley Point have put a lot of effort into community relations and keeping members of the public informed about decommissioning progress. A Business Breakfast was held in November 2007.
- (xii) This years Christmas card competition received nearly 1,500 entries from local schools. The money raised from the sale of these will be donated to Dorset and Somerset Air Ambulance.
- (xiii) The site has introduced a new safety initiative to encourage people to complete Point of Work Safety Assessments. For each one completed the site will make a donation to Penrose School to help purchase interactive monitors.

Questions relating to the A Site Report:

Mrs Brown asked what category of waste the spoil on the C Station land is. Mr Watkins explained that the spoil contains no radioactivity and is very similar to garden soil.

Mr Hudd asked if all the spoil would be accommodated in the Turbine Hall. Mr Watkins explained that about 25% would be used in the Cooling Water Pump House area and the rest would go in the Turbine Hall but would not fill the area.

Mr Williams asked what the metal from the smelted pond skips would be used for. Mr Watkins said that the metal was currently being used to produce shielding blocks and cases for storing intermediate level waste. Some of the shield blocks were being used at an outlet in Japan. All of the metal is retained within the nuclear industry. It was also confirmed that all parties would have a financial gain from this process.

Mr Edney asked a question relating to the transport of these radioactive skips. He wondered whether there was any risk to the communities that the skips would travel through on their way to Liverpool for despatch to the US. Mr Watkins explained that the skips were dispatched in half height ISO containers. Each shipment consisted of two containers. Mr Ball added that if the skips were sent to the waste repository near Drigg they would still have to take a similar journey by road.

Mr Hudd mentioned the reference in the report to 'C station land'. He wondered if this was a general term used on site or if something was planned that the SSG didn't know about. Mr Watkins explained that it was an historical term that had been used for many years. This goes back to when the site was built. The cooling water intakes had three sets of pipes, one for A site, one for B station and a third goes to what is known as the C site land.

Mr Graham asked why Magnox Electric was splitting into Magnox South and Magnox North. Mr Watkins explained it was an NDA requirement for a future element of the competition process. Dr Warner, NDA, agreed that he would cover this in more detail later in the meeting.

6. LOW LEVEL WASTE DISPOSAL UPDATE

Dr Meehan gave a brief update on the project. The facility will be used to dispose of low level waste generated at Hinkley Point A Site during the early phases of decommissioning. He talked briefly about the fact that the low level waste repository near Drigg was running out of space and that on site disposal would avoid a 300 mile journey and cut down the cost to the taxpayer. The application documents are currently being updated as a few minor refinements have been made to the original design.

It is now envisaged that the planning documents will be submitted somewhere between April - June 2008. An exhibition will be arranged for the local community to learn more about the project in the near future. An application under the Radioactive Substances Act 93 is planned to be made in November 2008. Subject to all permissions being granted, the building work would begin in January 2011 this would make the facility available for use by 2013.

The chairman mentioned a settlement that had been reached in Cumbria with Copeland District Council with regard to Socio-economic benefits of the new scheme put forward at the low level waste repository near Drigg. Dr Warner has agreed to talk about this later in the meeting.

Questions relating to the low level waste disposal:

Mrs Brown made a few points relating to the proposed on site disposal facility. She wanted clarification as to whether the facility would be for storage or disposal of low level waste. She also felt that the facility at Drigg should take the waste rather than it being disposed of at Hinkley and she understood that disposal of waste at Hinkley had been ruled out because of the limestone at the site. Dr Meehan explained that the planning permission would be for disposal of low level waste rather than storage. Because the plans are for a near surface disposal the geological conditions would not be an issue. He had already explained that the facility near Drigg would not be able to deal with the whole country's low level waste.

The chairman commented that the low level waste sub group had now held quite a few meetings and that the intent of the proposed Hinkley facility had been made quite clear. He felt that the SSG members should now be clear that the facility would be to dispose of Hinkley Point A Sites low level waste rather than temporary storage. The facility would not take waste from elsewhere and would not be used for intermediate level waste. He said that the planning application would go into great detail with experts and consultees and he felt that public safety would be of prime concern.

Ms Child recognised peoples concerns for public safety but felt that the highest risk would come from the transport of this material to the facility near Drigg.

Mr Hudd commented that although all the presentations and meetings at Hinkley Point referred to the disposal facility being only for Hinkley waste, other presentation from the NDA still seemed to be referring to regional facilities. He felt there was a discrepancy in the information being presented. Obviously if regional facilities were used the safety issues of transporting waste would be relevant.

Dr Meehan assured the meeting that all the consultation around this project was based on the proposed facility at Hinkley Point to dispose of Hinkley waste only. Planning permission and RSA authorisation would have to be revisited before any other waste could be disposed of at the Hinkley facility. He also felt that space at Hinkley would be very limited and that it would be difficult to find space to dispose of any waste other than that produced at Hinkley.

Dr Warner, NDA, also confirmed that the facility at Hinkley would not take waste from other sites. He said that talks about regional ILW stores were ongoing but that a full consultation would need to be undertaken. He said that the planning permission for the ILW store at Hinkley Point was issued only for Hinkley intermediate level waste.

7. INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WASTE MANAGEMENT

The chairman introduced Mr Darke and Mr Kenney who are both involved in the project for dealing with the Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) at Hinkley Point A Site.

Mr Darke gave a presentation to inform the SSG of the current status of the project. The programme of work would continue for a number of years and the project wanted to identify future opportunities for SSG involvement.

Mr Darke explained that intermediate level waste was historically labelled and subsequently split into two categories, solid and wet. This material had been stored in vaults on site and is a by-product of 35 years of operation of the station. He explained that the current ILW strategy was to encapsulate the waste in cement after it had been retrieved from the vaults. The waste would then be stored in the ILW store in a passively safe form.

He went on to explain that the team were further forward on the concept phase for wet ILW than for the solid ILW. The team have been examining different technologies and identified that vitrification (turning something into glass) would be preferable to the original strategy of encapsulation. The benefits this technique offers are maximised waste stability (very robust waste form with a long geological life) and minimised waste volumes. Mr Darke said that he wanted to ensure that the stakeholder group were kept informed of any future developments and committed to attending future meetings as required to update the members.

Questions relating to the ILW presentation:

Mr Williams asked what the activity levels of ILW were. Mr Adcock said that ILW activity levels started at 4 GBq per tonne alpha and 12 GBq tonne beta gamma anything above this level that didn't give off heat would be classed as ILW.

Mr Brown thanked Mr Darke for the presentation however he was concerned to hear that the preferred option was vitrification. He felt that there would be a huge energy requirement to produce the necessary heat to carry out the vitrification process and that the process would be expensive and

also produce CO₂. Mr Kenney said that international benchmarking had been done. Switzerland and Japan had successfully been using this technology for more than five years with good results. The amount of energy required to produce the cement for encapsulation is actually larger than the amount of energy required by the vitrification process. The alternatives were analysed using the Environment Agency's model for carbon footprint and the vitrification process is more environmentally friendly requiring the smallest carbon footprint.

The chairman mentioned that as part of the planning process a BPEO (Best Practical Environmental Option) study is being carried out.

Mr Brown asked if there was any chance of radio-nuclides emissions being lost in stack emissions. Mr Kenney said that this had also been looked at. The analysis at this point showed that certain materials achieve a level of volatility during the process. The system that the site deploys to capture the gasses would have to be designed to manage this. The programmes that are being used by the Japanese and the Swiss are very effective and well within the regulatory requirements within their countries. Obviously any emissions would have to be within the regulatory framework for the site.

Mr Debenham asked if the delay in building the ILW store would effect the timescales for the management of ILW he also wondered when money would be available for the construction of the building. Mr Watkins said that the ILW store had been put on hold because the site was not ready to start storing waste. The construction of the ILW store will be timed so that it is ready at the appropriate time.

Mr Hudd asked if the timelines for the ILW store were based on the current strategy of encapsulation. Mr Darke confirmed that this was the case. He said that if vitrification is used as an alternative strategy the timelines could change. Mr Watkins said that the vitrification process could also result in a significant reduction in the number of packages.

Mr Hudd asked if the facility would have a finite life. Mr Kenney said whichever process was used, the facility would have a finite life associated with the processing of the materials. The life of the facility is addressed in the planning application as well as the decommissioning of the facility.

Mr Graham said he found the presentation interesting and informative. He felt that the industry was making a mistake in the fact that the decommissioning of both the A and B sites are being treated as two separate things. He felt the timescales in the presentation were very quick considering the decommissioning of the facility is planned for 2024. Mr Kenney explained that the facility would be designed and built, it would then operate for the time needed to process the waste and then it would be decommissioned to support the plan for entry into care and maintenance. The materials used to construct the facility would need to be disposed of. The design process will consider the disposability of the materials.

The Chairman suggested that perhaps a public open day could be arranged for people to come along and look at the proposals for ILW and ask any further questions. This received general approval.

8. REPORT FROM EMERGENCY PLANNING CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.

Mr Haslett reported from the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee meeting on 30 January 2008.

- The meeting acknowledged the support of David Jones, Avon and Somerset Constabulary who is retiring at the end of January. Richard Adcock has moved to a new role at Hinkley Point A Site and Nigel Martin is now the Emergency Planning Engineer at Hinkley Point B Station.

- The Somerset Council Civil Contingency Unit are placing new signs on the coastal path advising of the action to take in the event of a site siren.
- Hinkley Point A provided an adequate demonstration at the Level One NII witnessed Emergency Exercise on the 7 November 2007.
- Hinkley Point B had an exercise associated with the transport of radioactive materials. This was witnessed by the department of transport and was also deemed to be an adequate demonstration of arrangements.
- On 16 January, B Station performed an exercise that was witnessed by the office of nuclear security. Again this was an adequate demonstration.
- The Level One NII witnessed exercise for Hinkley Point B Station is planned for 27 February. A Level Two exercise is also planned for 3 & 4 December 2008. This will be to demonstrate the off site arrangements.
- Hinkley Point A Site are in the process of changing their plan to incorporate the new Magnox South name.
- Letters have gone out to the local community to brief residents about a notification system called 'Frontworks'. This is a telephone warning system that will operate in the DEPZ.
- The local authorities Civil Contingency Unit reported the off site plan as being revised and issued in February to responders. It is envisaged that the SSG would play a key role in assisting the community recovery committee.

Questions relating to the EPCC Report:

The chair asked if parish councillors that were members of the SSG would be expected to go back to their communities to discuss this. Mr Haslett understood that Mr Hurry from the Civil Contingency Unit was planning to give a presentation on the off site plan at a meeting in the future.

Mr Davies explained that the community recovery was a new element of the off site plan and they would like to test parts of the plan in December 2008 to focus on recovery issues.

9. NII REPORTS – QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The chairman explained that members should have received four NII reports covering the period from July to December. Two cover A Site and two for B Station. He commented that the B Station report from July to September did not get sent out to SSG members until very recently. Mr Smith commented that the report was sent to B Station on 29 October 2007 and they are responsible for issuing it to the SSG members. He said the report also gets posted on the HSE website. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/llc/2007/index.htm>. Mr Cann apologised for the delay in sending out the report in question. He explained that there had been an oversight on their part.

Mr Smith apologised for the fact that Mr Ford, the A Site inspector couldn't attend the meeting. He explained that the purpose of these reports was to provide the SSG with information about the NII activities on site.

Mr Smith wanted to give a bit of background to the 3rd quarter report (July – September – B Station) which talks about the Graphite Core Safety Case. Every 10 years British Energy have to carry out a thorough and systematic safety review. The review discovered new information which could potentially affect the safety case of the graphite core. These changes had to be evaluated. The company have provided a justification for continued operation and the NII have accepted this. British Energy have substantially increased the amount of inspection that will be carried out and this should provide sufficient information for the safety case.

Mr Treharne asked if the station would need to be shut down to carry out these inspections. Mr Cann confirmed that British Energy will do these inspections during the planned shutdown.

Mrs Brown asked if it was possible to inspect every graphite brick. Mr Smith said there was a difference between what was possible and what was reasonable. The NII would not expect the company to inspect every brick but they would inspect an adequate number to provide sufficient information to support the safety case. He said that a professional judgement had to be made by both British Energy and the NII that the station was safe to operate. Many barriers have to be satisfied.

Mrs Brown asked if any control rods had failed within the reactors. Mr Cann said there had never been any issues with control rods. Mr Smith said that if a control rod failed the company would automatically shut down the station and a serious investigation would be carried out. Mr Cann said that regular checks were carried out on the control rods and there had never been any issues over channel distortion.

Mr Smith also wanted to comment on a letter that the chairman had sent to the NII requesting information about the NII's involvement in the life extension of Hinkley Point B Station. Mr Smith said that the NII did not have any involvement in the decision. It was a commercial decision made by British Energy. The NII's concern is whether they have an adequate safety case.

10. ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REPORT

The chairman made a comment about a statement on the last page of the report which talks about a modification to fit bursting discs in the Reactor Pressure Vessel Safety Relief Valve system. He wondered if Mr Cann could give some more information about what that entails. Mr Cann explained that this engineering modification will add extra safety benefit to the filters associated with the safety relief valves with no detriment to the environment. Mr Roberts added that the Environment Agency had looked at the dose assessment and the doses are below the public dose limit. The Environment Agency regards the proposal as acceptable and has no objections.

11. NDA REPORT

Dr Warner gave a short presentation on some NDA news.

He said the NDA had announced that they had appointed a new Chairman. His name is Stephen Henwood. He joins the NDA from BAE systems.

The NDA will be creating a National Nuclear Archive which will keep lots of information and photos from the sites as they close down and are decommissioned. The archive will be based in Scotland.

The National Skills Academy for Nuclear has just been formally launched by government. The skills academy will take a 'Hub' and 'Spoke' approach, the venue for the SSG meeting is part of the spoke for the South West. The main Hub is situated in West Cumbria and the main nuclear academy is currently being constructed.

The NDA Socio-economic policy was approved by ministers last year and has now been published. Copies were available at the meeting but can also be downloaded from the NDA website. The policy deals with issues related to the closure of the stations such as employment, skills, education and community life it also deals with a number of priority areas where the local community depend on nuclear. Details of how to apply for funding are included in the document.

The West Cumbria Community Fund has recently been announced. This has been the subject of intense negotiations between Cumbria County Council, Copeland District Council, the NDA and UK Government. The fund is linked to the low level waste repository near Drigg and a planning application for new capacity. The principles of the fund have been agreed and are tied to a section 106 agreement which is part of the Town and Country Planning Act which recognises community benefit linked to the planning application.

Dr Warner talked about the NDA competition programme. There are three main areas:

- Low Level Waste Repository - competition is now in the final stages. Government approval for this contract should be forthcoming in the next few weeks.
- Sellafield Contract – Late last year it was announced that invitations for final tenders had been issued. An announcement is expected later in the year about who will receive the contract.
- When the NDA strategy was first issued it was decided that the Magnox sites would be divided into two regions for the purpose of competition. This has led to the separation of Magnox North and Magnox South. The competition process for Magnox South has been put on hold as a result of feedback from the supply chain and the fact that the low level waste repository contract and the Sellafield contract were also being competed and lessons learned from these competitions need to be considered.

Questions relating to the NDA Report:

The chairman mentioned the 106 agreement in Cumbria for a community fund. He said that Mr Rickards and Sedgemoor District Council had been involved in talks about a similar fund being set up locally which would be linked to the on site disposal of low level waste at Hinkley Point A Site. Councillor Hill confirmed that Mr Rickards was still involved in negotiations. He is working with NuLeAF (Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum). The chairman said he would try and arrange another sub group meeting to see what progress had been made in this area. Dr Warner said that there was a difference between the proposed facility at Hinkley and the one in Cumbria and this would need to be dealt with as a separate issue. He felt that if a community fund was set up in the Hinkley area it would have to be proportionate to the scale of the development and the impact on the local community.

Mr Williams asked if the NDA had any involvement with new nuclear build. Dr Warner explained that the NDA owned some land around the existing sites that may be of interest for new nuclear build. The NDA are also the custodians of much of the UK stock of nuclear materials which includes uranium and plutonium which could be used as part of a new nuclear programme. The NDA are not in the business of building new power stations.

Mrs Brown asked if the NDA had considered the effects of on site disposal facilities on the preferred end states. The NDA had asked the SSG to consult with the local community on this subject and the preferred end state for Hinkley was that of a nature reserve. Dr Warner said the NDA had considered this, however when the end state consultation took place it was made clear that this was just the first round of consultation and that further discussions would take place. Dr Meehan said that the project team had looked at the compatibility with the preferred end states and that on site disposal of low level waste would be compatible with a nature reserve.

12. CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS

The chairman said that he had been unable to attend the last national stakeholder meeting in November. The vice-chairman had attended the meeting but unfortunately was unable to attend this meeting of the SSG. He had heard that the NDA had been given a rough ride at the meeting, this was

mainly due to the draft business plan which had been issued for consultation. Many parts of the draft plan didn't relate to the actual programme of work at the sites. Mr Thomson had attended the meeting and the chairman asked if he had any comments to make.

Mr Thomson agreed with the chairman that there were many issues regarding the draft business plan. At the meeting, the NDA recognised the situation and have agreed to keep the stakeholders better informed in the future.

13. OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

Mr Jones spoke about a BBC programme which was due to go out on 29 February on BBC1. Both Magnox South and British Energy had been asked to comment on the programme which was based on a report by Dr Chris Busby into infant and perinatal mortality and stillbirths near Hinkley. The report has been funded by Stop Hinkley but has not been published yet. Magnox South and British Energy have issued statements to the BBC and Dr Julia Verne, director of the South West Public Health Observatory based in Bristol had given an interview to the programme. Mr Jones mentioned that some COMARE reports were available at this meeting which deal with these issues. The programme is part of the BBC Inside Out series.

Mrs Brown drew the SSG members attention to a reading list she had supplied which was available at the back of the room.

The Chairman said he had recently obtained a copy of the public health report for Somerset for the year 2005/2006 and there is no implication that the Sedgemoor statistics are any different to other areas of Somerset. He said he would invite a health authority spokesperson to a future meeting to answer some questions on this subject.

Dr Kellaway-Marriott said he would be interested in seeing the comparison with other counties.

Environmental Note: In view of the environmental concerns recently highlighted in the media, it was suggested that bottled water should not be used at future meetings other than exceptional circumstances.

14. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on 27 June 2008 at the Hinkley Point Training and Induction Centre (formerly the Visitors Centre)

Appendix 1

SSG Sub Group/Agendas, Consultations etc.

Mike Short	Chairman – Fiddington
Mike Caswell	Vice Chair – Stockland Bristol
Terry Williams	Kilve Parish
Barbara Child	Co-opted
John Edney	Somerset County Council
Gerald Hudd	Somerset County Council
Jo Brown	PCAH
Mervyn Brown	Otterhampton Parish
Alan Debenham	Stop Hinkley
Dawn Hill	Sedgemoor District Council
Paul Tipney	West Somerset District Council
Anne Fraser	Sedgemoor District Council
Dr Kellaway-Marriott	North Somerset
Chris Morgan	West Somerset District Council