

Site Stakeholder Group Land Quality Subgroup

**THE SECOND SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP LAND QUALITY SUBGROUP MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 29 SEPTEMBER 2008 AT HUNTERSTON A SITE.**

Present

Hunterston A Site

Mr Steve Saunders
Mr Donald Ashburn
Mr Jon Dolphin
Mr Reuben Phillips
Mr Derek Rooney

Site Stakeholder Subgroup

Mr Kenny MacDougall (Chair)
Mr John Lamb
Mrs Rita Holmes
Mr Daniel Reid
Mr Peter MacFarlane
Mr Ivor Roscoe

In attendance

Mr Hugh Richards (Magnox North)
Mr Duncan Jackson (Enviros)

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Mr Kenny MacDougall welcomed everyone to the second meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group Land Quality Subgroup.

Mr Jon Dolphin introduced himself to everyone as the new Project Manager on the Land Quality Management project, having recently taken over from Ms Lorna Lavelle. Mr Dolphin added that he looked forward to engaging with the group through future SSG and subgroup meetings.

Apologies were given for Mr John Robertson, Mr Ian Frame, Mrs Sandra Jack, Mr Tony Bale, Mr Hugh McGhee and Mr Frank Craig.

2. TOUR OF ZONES E & H

The group were then taken on a detailed tour of Zones E & H by the Land Quality team.

3 Q&A: ZONE 6 – VLLW PITS

No questions were raised at this point.

4 LAND QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRESENTATION

Mr Jon Dolphin, Mr Steve Saunders, and Mr Donald Ashburn then presented the Land Quality Management Presentation to the rest of the group, and welcomed any questions thereafter.

5 Q&A

Mrs Holmes disagreed with a statement from the documentation that there was no risk to the public or critical groups, and made the point that not everyone would agree with this.

Mr Reuben Phillips explained that there is negligible risk, and a further inventory still in the ground which the Site is taking measures to remediate.

Mr MacDougall added that the wording should be removed from the document for future reference. Mr Dolphin agreed with this and thanked Mrs Holmes for voicing her concern.

Mr MacDougall presented the group with maps which queried sub sea erosion, and asked if sediment areas which do not exist on these maps could be checked as this could potentially affect the VLLW pits. Mr Dolphin commented that he did not have this information, but would check with a larger map and report back on the matter.

Mr John Lamb asked why the redundant pipe work, found to be damaged in 1978, was not removed at the time. Mr Phillips stated that while sections were removed, the management decision at the time to leave the majority in situ may have been based on the fact that the pipeline is within the licensed site. With regards to final site clearance, removing the pipeline is a future scope.

Mr Lamb questioned why, if there is little or no risk, was low and very low level waste from the pits and zones E & H not removed, sampled, and put back into landfill if clean. Mr Hugh Richards explained that instead of digging up the VLLW pits, an enormous number of boreholes have been drilled in order to gain samples, the results of which the land quality team are satisfied with. Mr Phillips added that there are different classes of waste in terms of what is being disposed of – while Hunterston A dispose low level waste to Drigg, Dounreay are disposing waste of a higher activity band.

Mr Lamb asked if there was any reason why the current 18" outfall pipeline could not be closed and replaced with a new one. Mr Saunders confirmed that this was possible, but was all part of the strategic options appraisal. Mr Ashburn added that another option would be to put in a brand new 15 and 18" outfall surface water pipeline and rather than seal the 18", just remove it.

Mr Lamb then queried why the 15 and 18" outfalls both ended up above water low mark. Mr Phillips responded that they were there principally to drain the road.

Mrs Holmes asked how far down the water table is in the CP7 compound. Mr Saunders confirmed that the water table is 4.5m down, with boreholes drilled to 6m when investigating made ground. The boreholes will all be decommissioned according to appropriate standards.

Mrs Holmes requested more information on what exactly needs to be removed from the CP7 compound. Mr Richards explained that a strategic options study is being held in order to answer this question. One option could be to remove a minimal amount of material so that sediments are not released into the foreshore with remaining land left in place permanently. Another option would simply be to take all the land away completely.

With regards to Site End States, Mr MacDougall asked if the strategy plan had taken into consideration the possibility of a removal only option. Mr Richards confirmed that exactly what was written in the consultation on End States had been written down. When Mr MacDougall touched on the preferred stakeholder option of complete clearance, Mr Richards and Mr Saunders responded that there has to be a definition of what is meant by contamination.

There has to be a link between the source and the receptor, and if no link exists, then there is no contamination as such.

Mr Daniel Reid raised the point that he had not heard any reference made to the existing land drains or drainage within the agricultural land. Mr Saunders commented that boreholes had been drilled in the area and extensive investigation work carried out, however no land drains had been found.

Mr MacDougall asked why there was an increase in the average activity of Cs-137 in foreshore sediments at the 18" outfall during certain years. Mr Ashburn explained that the increase was due to site work beginning to remediate the area, therefore sediment disturbance in the land drain system.

Mr MacDougall queried where the data regarding critical groups not being affected was based upon / gathered from. Mr Saunders replied based on the number of human habit surveys by the regulators.

Mr Dolphin asked if the group were happy with the optioneering report which was made available at the last SSG meeting. It was explained that this report covers the options which have been looked at for dealing with the VLLW pits, while giving an overview of the methodology involved. Mr MacDougall stated that both he and other members of the group did not have a copy of the report, and as a result would feed back any issues as the next subgroup meeting.

Mr MacDougall went on to add that the role of the SSG needs to be clarified regarding the VLLW pits. Mr Saunders replied that the subgroup were asked at the last meeting if they were happy to support the Land Quality team's forward strategy, in terms of managed containment and enhancing the containment, and assumed this would be fed back at the main SSG meeting on 18 September. Despite being on the agenda, more contentious matters arose which took precedence, but Mr MacDougall said this matter would be brought up at the November SSG meeting. However, it was noted that following a statement read by Mr MacDougall at the SSG meeting on 18 September, no challenges were made therefore in that respect, it could be taken that the SSG had endorsed what was proposed by the Land Quality team.

Mr MacDougall thanked the Land Quality team for a very good and thorough presentation, and everyone else for their attendance.

Mr Kenny MacDougal
SSG Vice Chairman