

## Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group - Notes

### **SUB-GROUP MEETING OF THE SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP - Hunterston A SSG meeting to discuss setting up a public consultation on Site End State.**

**Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2006 in Conference Room 1, Hunterston A, West Kilbride**

#### **PRESENT**

##### **North Ayrshire Council**

Councillor Richard Wilkinson (Chair)  
Mr Kevin Thomas

##### **National Farmers Union**

Mrs Eleanor Lamont (Deputy Chair)

##### **Community Councillors**

Mr Kenny MacDougall - Ardrossan  
Mr John Lamb - West Kilbride  
Mrs Rita Holmes - Fairlie  
Mr John Robertson - Largs  
Mr Ian Frame - Millport

##### **British Nuclear Group**

Mrs Alyson Russell-Stevenson (SSG Secretariat)  
Mr Peter Roach

##### **Hunterston Estate**

Mr Angus Cochran Patrick

Members of the public were not in attendance.

**Apologies were received from Mr Tony Bale.**

#### **1. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS**

Mrs Eleanor Lamont welcomed the members of the sub-group of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group (SSG). She explained this was a follow on from the last sub group on the 26<sup>th</sup> April where a start was made on the SES.

Mr Wilkinson asked for clarification of the membership of the sub group – was it for the elected members of the SSG was this correct?

Mrs Lamont answered that her recollection was voting members.

Mrs Holmes and Mr MacDougall stated that it was their recollection that it was for any interested members of the SSG.

Mrs Holmes felt that this was at a disadvantage for people who might not be able to attend all the meetings.

Mrs Russell-Stevenson stated that it had been recorded in the minutes of the SSG that every member of the SSG was invited to the subgroup meetings.

Mrs Lamont stated that her impression of the subgroup was a management working group to discuss the issue of SES, to have an open and frank discussion not open to the public.

Mr MacDougal stated that this was not what he thought.

Mrs Lamont said that she did not want to restrict discussion only to Site End States, remuneration and so on so everything could be discussed in future meetings.

Mr MacDougall said everyone in agreement that the sub group is a management tool.

The consensus was that this was the agreement.

Mrs Lamont put it to the group that the sub group should only be voting members.

Mr Wilkinson answered that he agreed that it was for elected members only i.e. lay members, but it depended on what issues the sub group were talking about as they may need someone with more knowledge from the nuclear industry or regulating industry in to discuss.

Mr Robertson asked if it was going to be up to the 8 members of the community council, as if only 3 turn up the group is not going to progress any further. If people want to give up their time to come then surely they should be able to come along.

The group agreed that the subgroup should be made up of elected members, lay members and community councillors.

## **2. MEMBERS**

The minutes of the last Sub Group meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> April 2006 were amended and agreed as an accurate record.

## **3. MATTERS ARISING**

Mrs Lamont began with the progress on the action that she was undertaking which was producing letters for the Site End State. She explained that she had emailed most of the members with her draft letter and then sent out the letter to the various bodies – SEPA, NII, North Ayrshire Council, and Scottish Executive. She explained that she had one response and it was from the Scottish Executive. They said that they know of nothing to restrict the SSG's choice of option, as long as it all met with regulations and legislation in place.

Mrs Lamont went on to say that North Ayrshire Councils response was also received that day (19<sup>th</sup> July). Mr Thomas said that the Chief Executive of the company received the letter and it had been passed down to the correct group for response. The Development Officer then sent Mr Thomas a copy of the response saying that in terms of the local plan there are restrictions on the use of the site, so in terms of the End use it would have to comply. If there was going to be say Science Park etc. then there would need to be a change in the planning permission.

Mr MacDougall asked how many people/organisations had been written to.

Mrs Lamont said that it was in accordance with the suggested public consultation paper agreed at the last subgroup but off the top of her head there were about 10 of which she had received just the 2 replies. 1 which met the timescale and 1 that did not.

## **4. SITE END STATE CONSULTATION – UPDATE**

Mrs Lamont started with the fact of the good progress was being made to date and it was agreed that there would have a public consultation on Site End State. She continued that now they needed to move on to getting a set of best practicable options. The document from the

NDA was brought to the attention of the group. Mrs Lamont said that she thought that the NDA had realised that the Site End State Consultation was a huge task. And so they had produced this document to establish their guidelines, it was a very similar process to the diagram that Mrs Lamont produced.

Mrs Lamont went on to say that she, Councillor Wilkinson, Peter Roach and Alyson Russell-Stevenson would be attending a Scottish Executive meeting on the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2006 to discuss the Scottish Executives and NDA's expectations in the consultation process. Mrs Holmes said that she felt that the meeting would be a very important meeting there should be someone there who would not be pro-nuclear. Mrs Lamont replied that there would be representatives from Hunterston, Chapelcross and Dounreay, SSGs as well as 2 BNG representatives from each site, Scottish Enterprise members, NDA and Scottish Executive members.

Mrs Lamont said that she has spoken to June Love who was the SSG Secretariat for Dounreay, and they appeared to be way ahead of Hunterston with reference to Site End State Consultation at their site. Dounreay had already employed a professional organisation to do the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) study for them. Mrs Lamont then stated that she was putting it to the group that they take on a professional organisation to facilitate the process. They would not tell the SSG what should be done they would be employed to gather the options and present them to the members to make the decision. Mrs Lamont then added that Chapelcross had decided to do the same thing so the work need not be replicated from site to site and save some costs also. Mrs Lamont added that she felt that this was the best way forward as she did not feel like it was in her power to organise and run an entire public consultation.

Mr MacDougall said an independent company had in previous meetings been brought up and it was stated then that the SSG were not looking at bringing an independent company in. He was wondering why there was a turn around.

Mrs Lamont replied that there were also people in the group that wanted to use an independent consultant at the last meeting and now that there was more information available to the SSG she felt that that option should be looked at.

Mrs Holmes asked if the SSG wanted to spend money on a public consultation, as in her opinion this was a waste of time and should go straight to an independent consultant. Then the community councillors could go back to the community and relay to the public.

Mrs Lamont answered that the NDA wanted the public consultation carried out in line with their guidelines.

Mr Roach added that the SSG didn't have to do anything they didn't want to do. The question was basic in the fact that what end state do they want to have? Could they agree to listen to Mr Roach offer of the full use of the technical experts on site. He continued that the SSG budget was £30,000 and that £10,000 had been set aside for the SSG to use on consultants should they wish. They could have the process engineered for them or they could outsource – get a few

tenders together and pick one. He continued that they could abandon that idea and get some one in to do the BPEO study – survey work on site, but he explained that with the very tight timescales – that the best option for the SSG would be to tender for the BPEO work for an independent company chosen by the SSG as they would have to work to the shortest timescale in order to meet the NDA deadline of March 2007.

Mr Robertson agreed with Mr Roach that the SSG would need and should have professional advice. He continued that there were not enough of the SSG members to do the whole process, and they would need a professional to guide the SSG in the options available.

Mrs Lamont replied that the guidance would be the process and who the SSG asked opinion from would be up to the SSG members.

Mr Roach stated that a company would give the SSG all the options for every possible End State – cost, green field, how long it would take, the consequences of each. Then the SSG could look through the information consult on it and then decide what to take to the public.

Mrs Lamont went over the process for the SSG of the Site End State and pointed out that they were at ‘stage 2’ in her process map for coming up with a range of options, seek independent advice, gather information and then have a workshop with the independent sources and come up with the site options. Would also need to speak to the operator of the site as they could help and had offered, to advise on technical matters.

Mrs Russell-Stevenson stated that the site were more than happy to help out where they could and in whatever capacity the SSG would want them to.

Mrs Lamont put it to the group that the agreed expert company should come up with a list of options with input from everyone. Once got that together they could review whether it was required to get a professional body to put it to public consultation. She added that it could be websites, leaflet drops, response adverts, national newspapers etc...to get the information out and seek feedback.

A discussion then ensued the outcome of which was a vote to decide if and independent consultancy was going to be used.

Mrs Lamont proposed the idea and Mr Wilkinson seconded it. 4 votes to 3 votes in favour of the independent consultant to prepare the study of options and present back to the group. Motion passed.

The SSG subgroup then moved on and Mr Lamb suggested that they get together a tender pack for the companies they would consider, covering their references, rates and if possible to do it in the timescale detail provided. It is up to the SSG to produce the information on the tender.

Mrs Lamont asked Mrs Russell-Stevenson is she could draft this. Mrs Russell-Stevenson agreed.

Mr Roach said that they or a member of the Chapelcross team, who had just completed this work, would provide the expertise required to help produce tender, of which the SSG can modify and approve.

Mrs Lamont asked how soon this could be done.

Mr Roach answered that again it would be tight but he thought it would take a couple of weeks.

Mrs Lamont stated that this was agreed that this was the next step and now they need together to decide on companies.

Mrs Holmes stated that she was worried about how much this was going to cost.

Mr Roach said that the SSG would have to ask each company the costs within the contract to tender.

Mr Wilkinson added that they may need to make a case for additional funds.

Mr Roach said that he would see if he could help, but he would have to put a case to the NDA, and stressed that additional funding would come from the current site funding limit as there would not be new money allocated and this could mean a diversion of funds from decommissioning work into this area.

## **5. PROPOSAL TO EXPAND MEMBERSHIP OF THE SSG**

Mrs Lamont stated that at the last SSG meeting it was mentioned the possibility of expanding the SSG Group to new members. At present there has been 2 letters expressing interest. She asked if the members agreed that the SSG should expand.

A discussion ensued and it was put to a vote. 7 members were in favour of expanding the SSG.

Councillor Wilkinson proposed an application form for prospective members to fill in. The document was looked at and discussed and Councillor Wilkinson agreed to amend it to reflect the needs of the Hunterston SSG and send it to members to view in due course.

Mrs Lamont suggested that the group needed 5/6 new members. It was agreed that up to 5 new members were needed and 1 should be under 25 years of age.

Councillor Wilkinson put it to the group that they advertise in the newspapers and make Mrs Russell-Stevenson the point of contact.

Mr Frame made his apologies and had to leave the meeting (to catch the last ferry).

It was discussed and agreed that the membership could be 3 years and then the members have to re-apply to the group. It was agreed that the SSG board could co-opt members that can add value and expertise to the group.

It was discussed that the SSG would advertise in local papers as they cover a wide area. If can't source members locally then could advertise further a field.

## 6. **RENUMERATION**

At the last SSG the issue of remuneration was raised by Mrs Lamont. Mrs Lamont put it to the group if there were any issues on remuneration.

Mrs Holmes asked if this was a discussion for everyone to get paid that attends the SSG meetings, the attendees of MIGs and Wigs etc or the Chair and Vice Chair etc?

Mr MacDougall said that the issue was brought up with regards to attendance outwith the SSG groups, on business for the group and away for days at a time on MIGs and WIGs etc.

He explained that when he goes down south to these meetings he is the only SSG member out of all the groups that attends these meetings. He said that he felt that he is doing this voluntarily and he is sitting in a room with people who are getting paid to be there.

Mrs Lamont asked if Mr MacDougall and Mrs Holmes should be remunerated for attending the extra meetings held by the NDA.

Mrs Holmes said that by attending these meetings they were gathering more information than when they were sitting on the local meetings. She therefore wanted to stress the importance of attending these meetings.

Mrs Lamont asked Mrs Holmes when she last attended one of these meetings. Mrs Holmes replied that she was just back from one. Mrs Lamont then asked if the SSG had received her report on the meeting yet. Mrs Holmes replied that she had not done the report yet but would have it to the members before the next full meeting.

Mrs Russell-Stevenson informed the group of what was in the budget for the SSG and then they could take the issue forward knowing the facts. She explained that there was £1000 for the Chair and £1000 for the Vice Chair as agreed at the beginning of the year with the Chair. She continued that there was a total budget of £30,000 for SSG business. This was substantially more than there was last year (£5000) and the year before (£500). Mrs Russell-Stevenson explained that they had budgeted for the one off payment for the Chair and Deputy Chair, expenses, consultant, postage, advertising and hotel catering arrangements. Mrs Russell-Stevenson's said it was her understanding that accommodation, expenses etc for attending the MIG & WIG etc meetings came directly from the NDA and not from the site budget.

Mr MacDougall confirmed that he did receive his travelling expenses in full (albeit taking up to 6 weeks for reimbursement) and the NDA pay for accommodation but he felt this was not adequate.

Mrs Holmes mentioned that she and spoken to Richard Mrowicki, NDA and he said that there could be a special case made for people who were spending almost half their week at these meetings between the Site Manager, Mr Roach and Mr Bargelt, NDA.

Mr MacDougall mentioned that Mr Bargelt had mentioned this to him as well.

Mr Roach stated that the issue of money that the site has set aside money for the 2 roles – Deputy and Chair. He explained that Councillor Wilkinson did not want it for this year and Mrs Lamont did and that this was in hand and he was awaiting a letter from Mrs Lamont. He continued that in the current budget there was no other money for other NDA meetings. Mr Roach said that he would intercede on the case for the SSG if they are attending these national meetings, and discuss with Mr Bargelt if the NDA should pay.

Mrs Lamont stated that she would be putting in for the £1000 this year

Mrs Lamont put it to the group that it should be agreed that Mr Roach would speak to Mr Bargelt for remuneration for Mr MacDougall, and that although the site already paid for the cover for Mrs Holmes to attend meetings, he would ask for additional to pay for Mrs Holmes being away from work and losing pay to attend meetings. The Group agreed this.

## **7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Councillor Wilkinson told the group that he had received a letter from the SSG Chair at Chapelcross inviting them to visit the site and attend a SSG meeting in the council chambers in Annan in September.

The issue was discussed and it was agreed that every member of the SSG should be invited by letter. It was agreed that a letter would be sent out with a programme detailing the schedule, programme and accommodation details.

Mrs Lamont then asked if there was an update in the Chapelcross ILW Store issue.

Mr Roach replied that there update from the last report on this matter other than that since Mr Roach addressed the issue at the last meeting it had made the media, reached the Scottish Executive, national, local press and radio. Mrs Holmes asked if this was not a good thing. Mrs Russell-Stevenson replied that she had spend almost 3 weeks worth of additional work on these matters and that she would have been happy to clarify and queries or questions on this matter in just one call. She continued that the person who had gone to the press had reported incorrectly in a number of areas and should she had been asked it would have been reported correctly. She stated for the record the ‘facts’ reported were completely incorrect and not what was reported to the members at the SSG by Mr Roach. Mrs Russell-Stevenson stated that she was content that important issues may get into the papers etc in view of openness and transparency as long as an accurate and balanced account was given.

Mr Roach asked that if there were any further questions that he was happy to answer them and again report the correct facts to the members present.

Mr Roach informed the group that there had also been no progression in the discussion of the potential move of waste to another country (Sweden).

Mr Roach then moved on to the issue of the failing state of the glass in the reactors. Mr Roach then showed the group the material and explained the system to hold it that was planned to put over the reactors. He explained that this was really just a 'no surprises' and purely a heads up that this would be addressed at the September meeting of the SSG.

**8. CLOSE OF MEETING**

Mrs Lamont closed the meeting and thanked everyone for their continued support and commitment for attending meetings, and their preparation beforehand in reading the 'mountains of paperwork' which had become part of being a member of the SSG.

**Mrs Eleanor Lamont**  
**SSG Deputy Chair**