

HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

The twenty third meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group will take place on Thursday 3 March 2011 in The Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan at 1.30pm. (1pm for lunch)

AGENDA

13.00 Lunch and information gathering

13.30 Chairman's opening remarks

Chair and Vice Chair updates and correspondence

13.50 Approval of previous minutes

14.00 Hunterston B Station Reports

John Morrison, Hunterston B

Mark Tyrer, NII

SEPA – Report only

14.30 Socio-economic/Hall Aitken update

15.00 Tea & Coffee

15.15 Scotland's Higher Activity Radioactive Waste Policy 2011

15.45 Hunterston A Site Reports

Peter Roach, Site Director, Hunterston A Site

David Rushton, Programme Manager, NDA

Ian Robertson, Hunterston A Site SEPA Inspector

NII – report only

16.45 Round up public Q&A

Future Meetings:

Thursday 2 June 2011 at 1.30pm, Seamill Hydro, West Kilbride

Thursday 8 September 2011 at 1.30pm, Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan

Thursday 8 December 2011 at 1.30pm, Brisbane House Hotel, Largs

17.00 Close

Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group

**THE TWENTY SECOND HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 16 DECEMBER 2010 IN THE LAURISTON HOTEL, ARDROSSAN**

Present:

Magnox North

Mr Peter Roach
Mr Reuben Phillips
Mrs Kerry McMillan (Secretariat)
Mr Tony Bale (Chair)

British Energy

Mr Jim Telfer
Mr Stuart McGhie
Mrs Anne de Koning
Andy Taylor

Community Councillors

Mr John Lamb - West Kilbride
Mrs Rita Holmes – Fairlie (Vice Chair)
Mr Peter MacFarlane – Largs
Mr Kenny MacDougall – Ardrossan

Councillors

Cllr Robert Barr
Cllr Alex Gallagher

Hunterston Estate

Mr Angus Cochran-Patrick
Mr Ralston Ryder

NDA

Mr David Rushdon
Mr Bill Hamilton

NII

Mark Tyler

SEPA

Mr Keith Hammond
Mr Ian Robertson

North Ayrshire Council

Mr Hugh McGhee

In Attendance

Dr Adam Meehan, Magnox North
Mr Stephen Worrall, Magnox North
Mrs Shelagh Milligan, Magnox North
Mrs Alison Shaw, Magnox North
Mr Derek Rooney, Magnox North

Mr Kevin Davis, Magnox North
Mr Jon Dolphin, Magnox North
Allan McRae, CNC

A representative from the local press and several members of the public were also in attendance

Apologies:

Mr Ian Frame, Mr John Robertson, Ms Claire Cook, Dr Les Davies, Mr Chris Kemp, Cllr Elizabeth McLardy, Cllr Elisabeth Marshall, Cllr John Reid, Mr Robert Turner, Kevin Thomas and Karen Jackson.



1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Chairman Tony Bale welcomed everyone to the 22nd meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group (SSG).

2. CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR UPDATES/CORRESPONDENCE

Mrs Kerry McMillan advised the group of a slight change to the agenda in that Mr Jim Telfer was deputising for the Hunterston B station director. Mrs McMillan also extended a warm welcome to Mr Mark Tyler, NII inspector for B station who replaces Mr Peter Rothwell.

Mrs McMillan went on to read out part of a letter received from a retired former employee, in a response to some recent press interest; *"Could you please inform Mr Douglas MacFarlane that the whole length of the original single containment discharge pipe was replaced from near the Feedwater Treatment Plant to the Syphon Seal of the CW discharge culvert with a new line with secondary containment and inspection chambers. The old pipe was decontaminated by acid cleaning and then pumped full of cement grout. All this was carried out to the satisfaction of the NII under Plant Modification Procedures.*

New test wells were installed on the site boundary and on the foreshore as it was foreseen that flood water may pass through contaminated ground within the site boundary which presumably is what occurred during the recent flooding incident."

The original press article referenced a recent leak of contaminated silt, on which Mr MacFarlane had commented on. Mr Peter Roach explained that the individual who had written to the Site was a previous employee and local resident who had read the press article and wished to clarify some points raised.

Mr Bale informed the group that he and Mrs Rita Holmes had attended the Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and the Higher Activity Waste post consultation meeting in Ayr. Mr John Lamb attended the Higher Activity Waste post consultation meeting in Edinburgh.

Mr Bale advised the group that the draft NDA business plan was now available for consultation. Copies were available at the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Mr Kenny MacDougall wished to make a correction to page six, paragraph 7a, to read "Mr Kenny McDougall was under the impression that the contamination found in the CP7 compound had already been highlighted and asked for clarity on what had been found." Mr MacDougall also asked for clarification on the new contamination that Dr Stephen Price had mentioned. Mr MacDougall stated that various members of the group remember signing off the land quality report and asked if the new contamination is in fact the contaminated silt previously leaked during the floods. Mr Peter Roach confirmed that there was no new leakage of contamination at Hunterston A Site other than the previous leak of silt back in September.

Mrs Holmes felt that there was more dialogue on the Graphite Pathfinder Project cell. In addition Mrs Holmes highlighted a possible error on page five, paragraph four, the survey referred to was the British Geological Survey.

Mr Bale requested that more detail was included in future minutes when presentations were given.

The secretariat will check the previous audio file and make the necessary amendments. Mrs McMillan also made assurances that the minute would be sent out more promptly in future.

Action: KEM

Mr Bale suggested that the minutes be approved once the above changes are made and both Mr MacDougall and Mrs Holmes are happy with the amendments.

4. GRAPHITE PATHFINDER PROJECT UPDATE

Dr Adam Meehan gave an update presentation on the Graphite Pathfinder Project. The following discussion took place:

Mr Hugh McGhee asked if retrieval of the waste was planned for the future. Dr Meehan confirmed that retrieval is a key part of Scottish Government policy and the team are looking at means by which the waste can be recovered if required.

Mr Stuart McGhie asked if the disposal cell is final storage or intermediate. Dr Meehan clarified that the team are talking about final disposal but many stakeholders feel it is prudent to factor in the ability to retrieve the waste as we don't know what the future may bring. There is a tension with a disposal facility as it needs to be as robust as possible to overt anyone digging into the facility.

Mr McGhie further asked if there would there be cameras and alarms within the facility. Dr Meehan clarified that the team are currently looking at boreholes to monitor the facility but are not planning to have any monitoring systems inside the facility.

Mr McGhie also asked if the coastline and shoreline erosion had been looked into and would it be more desirable for the facility to be under the sea bed. Dr Meehan explained that the concept is to site the facility as such so that it is robust in dealing with coastal erosion and sea rise. Dr Meehan also clarified that having the facility under the sea bed but it is not required for the safety case but it would help.

Mr McGhie pointed out that the proposed site is not on the current nuclear licensed site and asked if the existing boundary would be extended. Dr Meehan clarified that the facility would need to be fenced off and that a replacement location being looked at is at the foot of Goldenberry Hill, within the current site boundary.

Cllr Alex Gallagher asked about the future use of the old construction site. Mr Roach confirmed that the disposal cell would not be located on this area of land which is situated further up the coastline. Cllr Gallagher went on to ask how the risk is affected by the tide. Dr Meehan explained that the risks to the public need to be less than one in a million forever. The safety case is looking out over hundreds of thousands, possibly millions of years. An example currently used by the team is what would happen if glaciation completely destroyed the facility. In this scenario, risks to public would be completely trivial. The team are looking at short, medium and long term risks.

Mrs Holmes asked if the waste is safer in the store or in the disposal cell. Dr Meehan reiterated that the store is an interim solution and that Scottish Government are looking for a permanent solution to dealing with waste. It is appropriate that waste, for which there are solutions for, is managed correctly and not left to future generations. Mrs Holmes, felt that adding the retrievability element weakens the argument to have the cell. Dr Meehan explained that SEPA requires the team to look at the best practical means that can be applied

to the design of the facility. A multipronged approach is being taken to ensure that the waste could be recovered in the future by mining into the facility. Systems are not being put in place for the waste to be retrieved as the intention is for the disposal cell to be a permanent option.

Mrs Holmes asked how the waste would be transported to the disposal cell. Dr Meehan confirmed the waste would be transported by a shielded truck known as the cross site transporter. Mr Douglas MacFarlane asked if that was the same vehicle currently being designed to transport waste to the ILW store. Dr Meehan confirmed that this is the same vehicle and that the design team would ensure compatibility.

Mr MacDougall suggested that the concept of retrieval has been in the Scottish Government policy since day one and as the Graphite Pathfinder project team are looking at final disposal of the material, queried whether the project team were going against Government policy. Dr Meehan clarified that Scottish Government policy talks about near site, near surface storage or disposal with retrievability. However, according to Dr Meehan, the Scottish Government recognises that retrievability is not necessarily the best description for waste that has been disposed of and possibly a better description would be recoverability whereby waste which has been disposed of could be recovered at a later date should that become a better option. Mr Roach added that the team are following what the Scottish Government policy demands. Mr MacDougall suggested that there is a play of words being used.

Mr MacDougall asked for confirmation that the team are looking at creating one disposal cell. Dr Meehan clarified this.

Mr MacDougall went on to ask what other alternatives the team were looking at. Dr Meehan explained that the NDA have looked at a variety of different options including treatment, recycling and deep geological disposal and the Graphite Pathfinder Project had specifically tasked with looking at disposal of the waste. Mr MacDougall went on to talk about a Spanish facility which treats graphite and is apparently classed as a showcase facility by the Scottish Government. He asked why the project team were not looking to this. Dr Meehan explained that the Spanish facility do not have a final solution at the moment. Other countries with graphite waste such as USA and Japan are looking to disposal.

In addition, Mr MacDougall asked about the types of radioactivity and the half life attached to each in particular Chlorine 36 which has a half life of 301,000 years. He suggested that disposing of such waste on the Clyde coast and near fault lines was not a good idea. Dr Meehan reassured that the safety case looks over 100,000's even millions of years, taking into account seismic events and that from the work carried out to date, the team have every confidence in the disposal option.

Mr Bale asked for clarity of the two proven facilities that have gone down the disposal route. Mr Meehan confirmed that Nevada, USA successfully disposes of graphite waste and that and a test cavern in Japan was underway. Mr Bale further asked who will make the final decision on whether this option is right or wrong. Dr Meehan explained that SEPA would scrutinise the safety case and would ultimately give approval, however the project team also had a peer review contract in place and SEPA is also in contact with the Health Protection Agency who will provide independent scrutiny.

Mr McFarlane asked about a disposal facility for the graphite from the reactor core. He identified that one disposal cell would not be enough for all the graphite waste. Dr Meehan agreed that the feasibility study is looking at disposal of the graphite sleeves currently stored

in bunkers. He continued to explain that should the feasibility study prove the disposal cell to be a safe and viable option then two more cells would be required for the core graphite.

Mr Lamb suggested that if the graphite disposal cell was to be added to the current licensed site then it would effectively change the current end state which is final clearance. Mr Roach explained that site is currently in discussion with the NII to establish whether the cell needs to be on a licensed site. Filling of the cell is likely to be a licensed operation therefore the boundary would be extended during this time. However once the cell is closed and if the long term post closure safety case allows, the area would be delicensed therefore not affecting the site end state. If however, this is not the case then clearly the team would have to go back and revisit the end state. The case would need to identify that the cell would present no danger.

Mr McFarlane asked what type of substrata had been found through the borehole drilling. Dr Meehan confirmed 20-30 meters of clay followed by sandstone for the rest of the drilling. Mr McFarlane further asked about the permeation of water given that the proposed site of the cell is so close to the coast. Dr Meehan explained that once the cell is sub sea level, water flow becomes much less and therefore having the cell below the sea bed is not a bad factor for the safety case.

Mr MacDougall asked what the team found during the borehole drilling after the sandstone. Dr Meehan confirmed that the sandstone continued to the full 100 meters.

Mrs Holmes felt that due to what the NDA are now saying on interim state, the work carried out on the site end state consultation would prove to have been a bit pointless. Mrs Holmes continued saying that an interim state would allow the NDA to do anything on the Hunterston A Site. Mr Roach replied that there were a number of Sites across the NDA that were being accelerated to Care and Maintenance, of which Hunterston A is not one of them. Mr Roach continued by explaining that the current plan is still to see the Site through to Care and Maintenance and that the Graphite Pathfinder Project is only a feasibility study.

A member of the public asked about the stability of the graphite waste. Dr Meehan confirmed that the graphite is an extremely stable material and that the vast majority of the contamination is locked inside the graphite. Dr Meehan explained that a stainless steel box will corrode away quicker than the graphite. The member of the public also asked if there would be any other feasible routes for graphite. Dr Meehan explained some other treatments such as carbon capture technology are not mature enough anywhere in the world at this stage and that it may never be economic to use such technology for graphite waste. Dr Meehan went on to say that currently interim storage or near surface disposal are the only mature enough options for dealing with graphite waste. The member of the public summed up by stating that other technologies would require burning the graphite which would release carbon dioxide into the environment whereas the Graphite Pathfinder Project team were looking at a safer and more environmentally responsible way of dealing with the waste at Hunterston A.

Cllr Gallagher asked why so much energy was being put into debating something that was so low risk to the public. Mr Bale explained that the purpose of the group was to ensure that all members had the opportunity to air their views and ask questions on topics such as this. Cllr Gallagher stated that a recent report in the local paper stated that coal fired power stations give off more radiation than a nuclear power station and asked for clarification of that point. Dr Meehan confirmed that the graphite waste is low risk but stressed the need for it to be managed appropriately. Dr Meehan explained that Cllr Gallagher was completely correct in



that the typical radiation doses from a coal fired power station is 100 times more than the doses received from a nuclear power station.

Mr McGhie asked if the NDA has two or more different views on dealing with the waste across Scotland, England and Wales. Mr McGhie also asked if there is a possibility that Scotland could end up with sourcing costs of multiple stores instead of one top quality disposal facility. Mr Roach stated that the difference with the Sites south of the border is that UK Government policy is still looking at deep geological disposal compared to the Scottish Government policy of near site, near surface disposal. Mr Roach continued to explain that they are not doing anything different in terms of dealing with long term disposal of graphite waste. Hunterston A is a bit unique given its volumes of graphite waste which made it an ideal candidate for the Graphite Pathfinder project. Some other sites may follow suit if the project team can make the case that the disposal cell is safe and the appropriate regulatory approval is achieved.

Mr Lamb asked if the whole of the proposed site to be excavated is boulder clay down to sandstone. Dr Meehan explained that there is very little clay across part of the site as some parts are straight into sandstone following the top soil. Other areas however have a high content of gravel within the clay. Mr Jon Dolphin explained his involvement in the graphite project and confirmed that part of the facility could possibly be situated within bedrock where borehole drilling identified very stiff clay.

Mr McFarlane pointed out that the examples of USA waste facilities were situated in totally different surroundings to that of Hunterston A in terms of climate and population. Dr Meehan agreed that there was no population surrounding the USA sites however, the safety case for these sites made generic and cautious assumptions appropriate for use at Hunterston. Mr McFarlane also asked about the current waste issues in America where by they would appear to be negotiating with Russia to send their waste there. Dr Meehan clarified this issue is with spent fuel not the low and intermediate level waste that is being talked about at Hunterston A.

Mr MacDougall wished to follow on from Cllr Gallagher's previous comment about the safety of the graphite. Mr MacDougall suggested that the group were discussing the length of time that the material is likely to be in the cell not just how safe the graphite is. Dr Meehan replied by reiterating how robust the facility would be and how low the risks were and that the technology which would be used is proven. Mr MacDougall said that the technology was not proven for the length of time being considered. Dr Meehan further explained that the team had looked at the consequences of all the barriers eroding and even then the level of risk was still acceptable in terms of the safety case. Mr Bale added that the project is still a feasibility study at this point in time and requires the safety case to be scrutinised by independent experts before anything else happens. Mr Bale invited a member of the public gallery to join the discussion at this point. Mr Jones had, until recently, been a geologist at Dounreay. He pointed out that the British Geological Survey had been carrying out studies around the World for decades and there is a lot of evidence on how various radioactive materials decay and behave over hundreds, thousands and even millions of years.

Mrs Holmes asked, in terms of release of radiation, what was the highest risk throughout the whole process of entering the bunkers, retrieving the waste then transporting and disposing it in the cell. Both Dr Meehan and Mr Roach explained the levels of regulation and scrutiny that the safety case would go through. Mrs Holmes asked about the use of independent reviewers similar to those used during the end state consultation. Mr Roach explained that there were already independent specialists working on the project and that at this stage there was no money in the budget to support further independent reviews.

Clr Robert Barr stated that if the group are not willing to accept the expertise of those working on this project, what is the alternative.

Mr Bale asked for clarification once again that when the feasibility study is complete, a report will be scrutinised by independent experts including SEPA. Dr Meehan confirmed this to be the case and that the only reason they don't have the report now is because the work has not been completed yet.

Mr MacDougall asked for further clarification regarding the proposed site for the facility. He asked if the current licensed site would be extended or if a new site would be created. Mr Roach replied that the land proposed to be used is owned by the NDA and that, subject to NII approval, the current licensed site would be extended for the operational part of the graphite project. Once the facility was closed over the graphite site would be de-licensed. The site will not be new or privately owned. It will still be owned by NDA.

Mr McGhee asked how stable the material is in terms of spontaneous combustion. Dr Meehan explained that the material is very stable and is extremely difficult to burn.

The graphite project team arranged to have a short film playing whilst the group took a comfort break.

6.A HUNTERSTON B STATION REPORT

Mr Jim Telfer, Work Management Manager, deputising for the Station Director, briefly reviewed the report as written. He confirmed that during the period, the station had a very stable period of operation, with no noteworthy events of either safety or nuclear significance.

Mr Kenny McDougall raised a question relating to the Level 3 exercise where he sought clarification as to the level of participation of external services and the use of local facilities for the evacuation of contaminated persons (in the event of a real emergency).

Mr McGhee advised Mr McDougall that the designated facilities are worked out by North Ayrshire Council and he believed in this exercise that West Kilbride Community facility was used. The actual civil contingencies plan is available on line and it contains all the detail he was seeking – who does what and how they fit into the picture. The exercise in question, “Stour”, was a Level 3 Exercise which was attended by Scottish Government observers, people from the different agencies and emergency services. A debrief session was held by the emergency planning services who would produce a detailed report. He would check if this had been produced and if it was available to view on their website.

Mr Bale requested Mr McGhee provide a copy of the Exercise report to the Secretariat who would distribute it to the SSG members.

Mr Lamb asked for clarification on what constituted a minor event within the radiological controlled boundary.

Mr Telfer explained that a typical example would be during routine surveys of taki mats, at exits from the radiologically controlled area, occasionally a small spot of contamination is picked up by a contamination monitoring probe. These occasional events are investigated and every effort made to track down the source of the contamination to learn how to stop it at source.

Mrs Holmes enquired as to whether the station was still looking to extend its lifetime beyond 2016 and, if the levels of repairs increased to a stage where it was not financially viable, would the station even consider closing earlier than 2016. Mr Telfer advised that over the next two years the station would be building up an assessment which would be presented to the Board at some point to allow them to make a decision on the safety and financial viability in applying for a further life extension. The station is periodically required to shutdown units to undertake maintenance on them and NII permission has to be given to restart those units based on them being safe to do so for the next operating period.

6.B NII REPORT

Mr Mark Tyler introduced himself as the new NII Site Inspector at Hunterston B, having recently taken over from Peter Rothwell who had prepared the report. If there were any questions on the report, he would be happy to take them back to his colleague for a response.

Mr Lamb had a question about the oil leaks from the gas circulators. Assuming that oil leaking into the reactor was now totally contaminated, by what route would the contaminated oil be recovered? Mr Telfer advised that some of the oil going into the unit gets vaporised and becomes hydrocarbons in the circuit gas. The station has a gas bypass plant which takes out moisture and keeps it at manageable levels. The majority of the oil goes into the shutter tube into which the circulator fits and that can be drained, subsequently it goes through a purifier and periodically some of the oil does get taken out and incinerated. The station has an authorisation for limited incineration of low level contaminated waste oil.

6.C SEPA REPORT

Mr Keith Hammond took his report as read adding that the RIFE report was now available on the SEPA website, as was the Scottish Release Pollutant Inventory. SEPA had also recently launched better consultation into regulation which might be of particular interest to SSG members. There were no questions.

7.A HUNTERSTON A SITE REPORT

Mr Roach presented the Hunterston A Site report and the following questions were raised.

Following on from a point raised by Mrs Holmes in a previous meeting, a member of the public asked if the Site had emptied the pond and started discharging the water. Mr Roach stated that the Site has not yet started to discharge water from the Pond and that previous conversations with Mrs Holmes were on a theoretical basis.

Mrs Holmes asked if the fuel rod previously found in the cooling pond is still in situ. Mr Roach confirmed this to be correct and that the rod is being properly stored and safely controlled under a new safety case prepared by the Site. Mrs Holmes went on to ask what the Site is going to do with the fuel rod in terms of removing it from the pond. Mr Roach explained that the first aspect was to ensure controlled storage and this had already been achieved. In addition, the Site had found another high activity item which is also properly stored. In terms of how to remove these items, the Site will be carrying out an optioneering study to look at the options available for removing the items and disposing to Sellafield. This particular matter is likely to add around six months to the programme of work and the Site will look at change control to ensure money is available.

Cllr Barr asked if the Site had received any feedback from the recent public open days. Mr Roach explained that the vast majority of feedback has been positive. Mr Roach added that

the main aim of the open days was to offer members of the community the chance to see the ILW store and get a more balanced view of the decommissioning work that is happening at Site.

Cllr Gallagher asked about the terminology regarding the dose rate to individuals. Discussion then took place with Mr Reuben Phillips and Mrs Holmes regarding what is considered a safe level of radiation. Mr Bale then asked if Cllr Gallagher wanted a simple yes or no answer. Cllr Gallagher acknowledged that the Site works to the standards but asked if the standards are a safe enough level for the workers and community. Mr Roach stated that the Site will try to produce some words that give greater clarity in future. **Action: R. Phillips**

Mr MacDougall referred to the Graphite Pathfinder Project and asked what would happen to the road when the Site needs to move graphite over a public right of way to the new facility. Mr Roach reminded the group that the project was not fixed but answered the question hypothetically. The graphite would be boxed and placed on the cross site transporter (XST) which would then go out through a penetration in the fence, possibly new or existing. The XST would then go along the road and there will undoubtedly be an interaction with the public road to enable the XST to get to the facility.

A member of the public asked at what speed the transporter travels. Mr Roach stated that there was a limit of 5mph around Site. Discussion then took place about potential delays and Mr Roach explained that this issue may need to be looked at when it comes to planning.

Mrs Holmes asked why the boundary was not being expanded to take in the road. Mr Roach explained that the road is already within the nuclear site boundary and that the main issue with moving the licensed site fence would be providing an alternative public right of way. Mr Bale intervened by explaining that this was an issue for the Site to sort out.

A member of the public asked for clarification on how often samples are taken from the outfall pipes. Mr Phillips confirmed that the Site sample this area twice weekly. Discussion then took place about the length of time taken to inform SEPA of the silt leak. Mr Roach explained that the company contacted SEPA within one working day of realising there was a problem.

Mr McFarlane asked why the Site still have a manual sampling regime for the CP7 and wondered if there was any reason why an online automatic system was not in use to keep tabs on the radiation. Mr Phillips explained that this particular matter involved a simple field drain and therefore would not warrant anything more technical than the manual sampling regime. Mr Roach added that the Site is looking into making improvements.

A member of the public asked if there was a report on the silt leak available through the public domain. Mr Roach explained that there is a report although it is not in the public domain. However it is not secret and if any member of the SSG would like to see the report please contact the Site.

7.B SEPA REPORT

Mr Ian Robertson took his report as read, giving emphasis to the final item in the report regarding the drain discharge incident. SEPA's basis for deciding to take enforcement action was essentially on a technical point. The nature of the incident was an uncontrolled release by an unauthorised route and therefore SEPA decided to issue the final warning letter. The amount of radioactivity that was discharged was very small. Mr Robertson described the amount as a tiny fraction of the authorised limit and SEPA is quite satisfied that the radiation

hazard to the environment & the radiation hazard to the general public was in fact very negligible.

Mrs Holmes asked if SEPA had treated the case differently because the incident happened outside of the legal boundaries of A Site. Mr Robertson clarified that the case was essentially looked upon as an unauthorised route and uncontrolled discharge.

A representative of the local press asked for confirmation of why the final warning letter was issued if the risk was negligible. Mr Robertson stated that although the risk was deemed to be negligible, technically the incident represented an uncontrolled discharge by an unauthorised route and that contravenes the conditions and the limitations of the RSA93 authorisation to the Site.

Mrs Holmes further asked what the route into the receptor would be for this type of contamination. Mr Robertson explained that the radiation dose assessment was based on the internal radiation with the possibility of external radiation. The external radiation was discounted because the radiation dose rates at the outfall were below measurable levels, indicating no external radiation hazard. The hazard lay with the possibility of internal radiation. The assessment was based on very conservative assumptions where an individual would need to inadvertently ingest two grams of sediment, with the highest recorded activity, in order to receive less than 1% of the annual dose that the population is exposed to. On that basis SEPA is quite satisfied at the radiation dose was negligible.

Mr McGhee asked why there appeared to be a delay between finding the elevated levels of Caesium on the 29th September and reporting to SEPA on 4th October. Mr Roach explained that the Site has scheduled times where routine measurements are taken. When the first set of results were received a decision was made to re run the samples as the elevated levels needed to be validated. As soon as confirmation of the levels was received, the Site raised the announcement and informed SEPA. The Site is required to report to SEPA within one working day and this target was met. There was no delay although it does appear that way on the calendar because of the weekend falling in between the results being confirmed and being reported to SEPA.

A member of the public asked if SEPA had figures for the above activities. Mr Robertson confirmed that the report states the levels as being 18KBq per kilogram which can also be looked upon as 18Bq per gram.

Mr MacDougall asked if 18Bq per gram is a small amount to which Mr Robertson replied yes.

Mrs Holmes asked Mr Roach why he had not informed the SSG of the silt release earlier than 2 November 2010. Mr Roach explained that he informed the group at the first available opportunity for a face to face meeting.

Further discussion then took place on information being passed to the SSG. Mr Roach assured the group that he was entirely clear as to his responsibilities with reporting incidents to the SSG and maintains an open and transparent policy. Mr Bale also confirmed that both he and the Vice Chair have the opportunity to meet with Mr Roach on a monthly basis or as and when the meeting is required.

7.C NII REPORT

In the absence of Mr Chris Kemp, to the report was taken as read and accepted without question.

8. NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY

Mr David Rushdon introduced himself as the new Programme Manager for Hunterston A Site. Mr Rushdon explained that the NDA had gone through an organisational effectiveness review, the outcome of which has seen a 30% reduction in staff. One of the consequences is that Mr Keith Riding has taken early retirement and Mr Rushdon has taken over from him. Mr Rushdon went on to say that he had been in position for six weeks and has been with the NDA for five years. Furthermore Mr Rushdon went on to talk about other changes to the NDA. He explained that there are two new executive directors namely Mark Lesinski, Executive Director for Delivery and David Vatters, Chief Financial Officer. In addition, copies of the draft business plan have been made available for collection today. Furthermore, the annual reporting accounts had recently been laid before parliament.

Mr MacDougall asked if Mr Rushdon would be dealing with Dounreay. Mr Rushdon explained that he would not be dealing with Dounreay but will deal with other Magnox and RSRL sites including Hunterston A, Hinkley Point, Harwell and Winfreth.

Mr MacDougall went on to ask why the NDA felt the need to pull out of the nuclear archives at Dounreay. Mr Bill Hamilton explained that the NDA is fully committed to the nuclear archives but they have yet to find other funders from within the industry to support this initiative. The NDA funding has been committed as highlighted in the draft business plan. Mr Hamilton suggested that there will be further activity over the next few months.

Mr MacDougall further asked why he could not find the minutes for other SSG meetings on the NDA website. Mr Hamilton and Mrs McMillan confirmed that any minutes or papers sent to the NDA are updated promptly. Mr Hamilton confirmed that there is no change of policy and he would check with the web manager.

Mrs Holmes asked if the Graphite project was going to have a detrimental effect on the West Cumbrian Partnership which is consulting with the local community regarding the deep geological disposal facility. Mr Hamilton explained that he couldn't speak for the West Cumbrian Partnership but he confirmed that the NDA is a Government Agency whose Minister is Charles Hendry. Mr Hendry made a very strong commitment for the deep geological facility, the funding for which is full steam ahead.

9. DATE & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

3 March 2011 at 1.30pm, Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan

Mr Tony Bale
SSG Chairman



Site Stakeholder Group

HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

Joint response to NDA Draft Business Plan 2011 – 2014 consultation

Members of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group wish to thank the NDA for affording them the opportunity to respond to the Draft Business Plan (DBP). The group have highlighted below, a number of important factors to be attached to the DBP in respect of Hunterston A's proposed 'key role' in the management of Higher Activity Waste (ILW).

Furthermore, the group fully expect that the NDA will adhere to its socio-economic policy in terms of employing a local workforce where possible to carry out decommissioning activities at Hunterston A Site.

Magnox Limited: Magnox Programme, page 20

'Development options of disposal for Graphite' - The Hunterston SSG asks for clarification on what the options are.

Hunterston A: 2011-2012 Key Activities, page 27

The SSG wish to include remediation of Compound 7 as part of the business plan for 2011-2014. This ongoing issue is as yet unresolved and SEPA have sent a warning letter to the Site.

The SSG also wish to include remediation of the high level waste items found in the cartridge cooling pond.

The above projects would appear to be in keeping with the NDA's **prioritisation and allocation of funding** (page 8) where priority will be focussed on 'the highest hazards and risks'.

Appendix 5 – 2011-2012 Planned Income and Expenditure Summary, page 42

Finally, the Hunterston SSG would expect to see an amendment to the cost of decommissioning and clean up for Hunterston A as indicated in Appendix 5 page 42, to show additional funding for the above two projects.

Hunterston SSG
24 January 2011



HUNTERSTON A STAKEHOLDER REPORT MARCH 2011

**HUNTERSTON A
SITE DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP
3 MARCH 2011**

Hunterston A has continued to make good progress on our programme of work and the Site remains very busy. It has been a challenging few months yet again due to weather conditions but our skilled team remain committed to safely delivering our planned work and being responsive to change.

1 SAFETY, SECURITY and ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW

1.1 Safety Performance

The downward trend in personal injuries continues resulting in a further improvement in safety performance. With there having been no significant injuries, other than those requiring First Aid treatment, the site Total Recordable Incidence Rate (TRIR) is now zero as from the end of January. This is the first occasion since February 2004 that site TRIR has been at zero. Considering the traditional hazards associated with major construction projects, the site is justifiably proud of this achievement. Day Away Case Rate, the measure of significant injuries, also remains at zero. With this improving trend the site remains on course to exceed the 2010/11 target set by the company for conventional safety performance.

The Hunterston A Site Annual Review of Safety Report was formally presented to regulators recently. Feedback was very positive and it was recognised that the Site has made significant improvements in many areas.

1.2 Learning and Improvement

The number of near miss events has also declined significantly since the last report, again a positive indication of an improving safety performance. The site continues to encourage a "positive reporting culture" from staff and contractors and although safety performance has positively improved to its current level, there is no evidence that the level of reporting has reduced.

The site Safety & Environmental Enhancement Plan for 2010/11 is well on target to achieve 100% completion. An element of the plan was to introduce a Safety & Learning "Drop-in Centre" as a tool to improve communication of health and safety issues. The "centre" is now operational and is available to staff and contractors to "drop-in" in at pre-determined times of the day to view videos, display boards and pick up information leaflets on a variety of health and safety topics.

2 DECOMMISSIONING PROGRESS

2.1 Pond

The Pond Decommissioning team is continuing with the removal of the sludge from the bottom of the pond in addition to the recovery and disposal of a range of small components and some larger plant items. Once the pond is clear of these items, the team can commence dewatering activities. The dewatering also includes the decontamination and sealing the pond walls and floor.

2.2 Land Quality Management

There are two main elements of work currently being undertaken by the Land Quality Management Project:

- 1) Remediation of the CP7 compound
- 2) Restoration of the Very Low Level Waste (VLLW) pits

Remediation of the CP7 compound

Whilst monitoring and weekly clean out of contaminated silts from catchpits is ongoing, the project has focussed on the development of long term options for the remediation of the CP7 contamination issue. A preliminary options study has been completed and a short list of options will be developed further. Options include; a complete excavation of all known contamination, partial excavation, settlement options and various treatment options.

SEPA has been briefed on the initial options and we continue to work with them in developing a solution to this issue.

Restoration of the VLLW Pits

After an extensive options study which involved consultation with the SSG and, in particular, the Land Quality subgroup, the restoration of the VLLW pits at Hunterston A has begun. The restoration has been designed to:

- Provide an enhanced barrier for the VLLW Pits in order to prevent intrusion by burrowing animals.
- Improve safe movement across the area by staff and members of the public.
- Improve the visual appearance of the area.

The restoration will be complete by the end of March.

2.3 Solid ILW Retrieval

The project is now well into the last phase with the team assiduously working towards completion of inactive commissioning. This will be completed in a progressive manner both in scope and extent (for example, as each sub-system is released, such as the conveyor, it will under go power-up check, static checks, functional checks, and integration tests).

All the equipment was fully assembled with a replica of the bunker, and integrated testing conducted with simulant graphite (and other materials) at the supplier's workshop during October – November 2010. As such, simulant will not be used at Site. Therefore, confidence is high that the equipment will work first time.

The culmination of the inactive commissioning will be a demonstration that the facility can process ten boxes (one week's production) of waste. It is anticipated that the inactive commissioning will be completed by the end of April 2011 (a small slippage of one month to this four year project).

The cross-site transport vehicle, which moves packages containing waste to the ILW Store, will also be delivered by the end of March 2011 (a four month slippage since our last report). This consists of three components; tractor, trailer unit, and shielding over-pack. The manufacture and assembly of all the components is complete, however the programming of the guidance system has been more complex than anticipated, thus leading to the delay in delivery.

2.4 Wet ILW

The project has performed well of late with key performance indicators showing an improvement from the previous period. There has not been any slippage to key Lifetime Plan milestones. On site, contractors FJ Booth have completed the roof cladding, despite one of the coldest winters on record affecting progress. The first fix of the Encapsulation Plant and associated equipment is complete, as is the retrieval pipework within the shielded duct.

Contractors Balfour Beatty Engineering Services have continued with containment and cabling works, whilst Senior Hargreaves have continued with the ventilation system which is now approximately 80% complete.

An acquisition strategy for the procurement of operational 3m drums has been issued and the delivery strategy for the commissioning and retrieval phases was presented to Site Stakeholders.

Stainless Metalcraft has commenced with the manufacture of thirty three commissioning drums.

2.5 Graphite Pathfinder Project

The feasibility study is on schedule and nearing completion.

All borehole drilling works, offshore and onshore geophysical investigations are now complete. The draft offshore investigation report is currently being updated to incorporate Magnox comments. There will be an ongoing sampling and characterisation campaign of the boreholes on site. From the results of this work it will be possible to establish the optimum location for the graphite disposal facility, should the project progress beyond the current feasibility stage.

Tannahill Reay have completed a draft 3D facility visualisation model which is currently being developed.

The preliminary Environmental Safety Case (ESC) has been submitted to the Magnox Nuclear Safety Committee, Independent Peer Reviewers, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, Intelligent Customers and key regulators including SEPA. Further development of the ESC will be required going forward. Currently, no issues have been identified within the project which would preclude near site, near surface disposal of Intermediate Level

Waste (ILW) currently stored in the Solid Active Waste Bunkers (SAWB) at Hunterston A Site.

An outline concept design of the proposed disposal facility is complete, which includes a Class 'B' (+/- 20%) estimate for the cost of construction.

The Environmental Impact Assessment is progressing well. The majority of the baseline surveys are now complete (with the traffic survey report outstanding).

The project is currently preparing a business case to secure further funding for disposal of the contents of the SAWB. This will include detailed development of the Graphite Pathfinder Project, but stopping short of commencement of construction. Further approval will be required beyond this stage to allow construction on site.

3 PEOPLE

3.1 Employee Relations

Internal recruitment is ongoing within the Engineering and Project Support departments. A number of developmental secondments are also ongoing. The current workforce stands at 190 core and 50 agency workers.

Sickness absence at Hunterston A is averaging at 3.83 days lost over the past rolling 12 month period, (2.17 days short term sick and 1.66 days long term sick) compared to the company target of 6.25 days. This is an improving trend monitored by Occupational Health and HR. However, it is recognised that we are expecting the long term sickness figure to increase due to known a couple of serious employee health issues which is being closely monitored by Occupational Health.

3.2 Learning and Development

As part of the Magnox Limited commitment to maintain and continuously build on the skills and knowledge of all that work at Site, the following programmes are examples of the learning interventions currently in progress at Hunterston A.

Following on from the recent Construction Design and Management (CDM) Regulations 2007 training programme, further workshops are being developed on specific topics relating to the safe and effective management of contractors on site. Example topics include Working at Height, Lifting Operations and Noise and Vibration. All involved in the management of contractors will participate in these workshops.

The Hunterston A lifting specialists are currently involved in a training programme to further enhance site skills for the rigging and slinging of loads on site. This will result in them attaining formal recognition through the Construction Plant Competence Scheme (CPCS).

The Leadership Development Programme for current and potential line managers continues with the first cohort awaiting the results of the academic element of the programme having successfully completed all of the theory and practical modules. Twenty delegates are currently on the programme and a further five have been identified to take

part in the programme for financial year 11/12. In addition to this Hunterston A have fourteen employees participating in Performance Development modules, further demonstrating the Magnox Limited commitment to continually develop and maintain employee skills and competence.

4 ENVIRONMENT

4.1 Radioactive Discharges

Solid

Low Level Waste (LLW) discharges to the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) continue. Discharges over the 12 month period from January 2010 to December 2010 equate to 136.5m³, representing 23% of our authorised disposal limit. Radioactive nuclide content of this waste was well below authorised limits. The main contributions to the waste consignments were from decommissioning projects such as SAWBR and wet ILW ground-works and pond cleanup operations.

Liquid

Liquid radioactive discharges during the period January 2010 to December 2010 were made at levels that represent less than 2.3% for total beta, 0.03% for Plutonium-241, 0.05% for Tritium and 1.10% for total alpha, of the Site's authorised discharge limit. The main contributions to the discharges were from miscellaneous sources on the Site, predominantly plant wash-down activities and filter backwashes.

Gaseous

Gaseous radioactive discharges during the period January 2010 to December 2010 were made at levels that represent 4.7% for Tritium, 4.8% for Carbon-14 and 0.83% for Beta particulate of the Site's authorised discharge limit. The main contributions to the discharges were from ventilation systems operating in contamination controlled areas and reactor vessel 'breathing'.

High Volume Very Low Level Waste (HVLLW)

The Site has received a varied Radioactive Substances Act (RSA) authorisation to allow disposal of HVLLW. It is likely that this waste will start to be consigned to the LLWR later in the year.

New Authorisation Application

The Site has submitted to SEPA an application for a new 'multimedia' authorisation for radioactive discharges. This authorisation (when granted by SEPA) will replace the Site's three current authorisations (solid, liquid and gaseous). This 'multimedia' authorisation will require substantial changes to the management systems and procedures involved on the Hunterston A Site.

As part of this work the Site will be preparing a presentation to the SSG on the details of the application, to be held at a future date.

The Site has been preparing to revise liquid discharge procedures ahead of receiving a new liquid discharge authorisation from SEPA which will include limits on conventional pollutants. This is part of an exercise to bring existing Radioactive Substances Act liquid discharge authorisations into line with Controlled Activities Regulations authorisations.

4.2 Non-radiological Environmental update

Environmental protection activities have included surveillance of the sewage treatment plant, including the analysis of discharge samples, sampling and analysis of effluent discharges relating to the liquid and gaseous discharge systems, monitoring electricity and water usage, examination of recycling opportunities and undertaking actions specified in its Biodiversity Action Plan.

The Site Environmental Committee continues to meet every three months and continues to review ways of promoting environmental awareness.

4.3 Environmental Events

There were no environmental events in the period November 2010 to January 2011.

5 RADIOLOGICAL SAFETY

Explanatory note: The maximum permissible dose to a radiation worker in the UK is 20mSv (milliSieverts) in a calendar year. The average annual radiation dose to the UK population from all sources is 2.6mSv. Collective dose is usually measured in man.milliSieverts. For example, if ten people were each to receive 0.1milliSieverts during a particular task, then the collective dose for the task would be 10 people x 0.1mSv each = 1 man.milliSievert.

Doses for the calendar year 2010 (up to 31 December 2010) are as follows;

- Employees received a collective dose of 11.374 man.mSv;
- Contractors received a collective dose of 31.542 man.mSv;
- The highest individual dose received by an employee was 1.521 mSv;
- The highest individual dose received by a contractor was 3.040 mSv.

The majority of dose accrued in 2010 has been from a combination of the Cartridge Cooling Pond decommissioning projects and other site projects. All doses in these projects have been prior-assessed, planned and are tracked throughout the project duration to ensure that no limits are exceeded.

5.1 Radiological Events

There were no radiological events in the period November 2010 to February 2011.

6 EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Emergency exercise training has recently being orientated towards conventional safety with tabletop training focussing on testing the teams on more security themed exercises.

The recent training has allowed us to add new members to the emergency teams. A new Emergency Controller is also due to complete training in the near future.

In December, members of the Special Operations Response Team (S.O.R.T.) from Scottish Ambulance attended site on a familiarisation tour. S.O.R.T. are a specially trained

tactical response unit, trained in Breathing Apparatus (B.A.) and Radiological awareness. The team were impressed by the emergency facilities and the level of training on site and found their day both informative and enjoyable. Hunterston A have also offered them the use of the onsite B.A. training facility for their own training.

7 NATIONAL MATTERS THAT LINK TO HUNTERSTON A

NDA draft Business Plan 2011-14

The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority published a draft Business Plan 2011 – 2014 for consultation. The consultation ran for eight weeks and closed on 26 January 2011. The document sets out the NDA's key objectives and the progress it expects to be made across its 19 sites over the next three years, in line with its recent funding settlement. Tony Fountain, NDA Chief Executive Officer said: "In the current tough economic environment this is a vote of confidence from Government in the NDA's mission. We now need a sustained drive on performance right across our estate to achieve value for money and a continued reduction in support and overhead costs."

The Hunterston SSG submitted a joint response to the consultation and subject to approval by both the UK and Scottish Governments, the final version of the Business Plan will be published by the end of March 2011.

Scotland's Higher Activity Radioactive Waste Policy 2011

On Thursday 20 January 2011, the Scottish Government published its policy for higher activity radioactive waste arising in Scotland and the Post-Adoption Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Statement.

The documents can be accessed at www.scotland.gov.uk/hawpolicy and www.scotland.gov.uk/hawpostadoption. Copies of the documents have been requested.

The Scottish Government position remains that it does not support deep geological disposal of radioactive waste. The Scottish Government policy is that the long-term management of higher activity radioactive waste should be in near-surface facilities. Facilities should be located as near to the site where the waste is produced as possible. Developers will need to demonstrate how the facilities will be monitored and how waste packages, or waste, could be retrieved. All long-term waste management options will be subject to robust regulatory requirements.

8 PA/PR ACTIVITIES/CHARITABLE DONATIONS

Hunterston A is delighted to continue supporting the local community by funding worthwhile groups and organisations. The following highlights groups which have been allocated funding by Hunterston A since September 2010:

<i>Soc-Ec & Charity Donations:</i>	£
Glencairn Primary Eco Project	2,000
Chernobyl Lifeline Charity	300
Yorkhill Children's Foundation	78
Total	£2,378

9 SITE VISITS

Hunterston A Site continues to attract the right kind of interest through our excellent performance. A selection of visitors during the period included:-

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 22/12/10 | Special Operations Response Team visit to Site |
| 10/01/11 | Graphite Pathfinder Project presentation to Cumbrae Community Council |
| 24/01/11 | Keith Spooner, EHSS&Q Director, Magnox, visit to Site |
| 26/01/11 | OCNS at Hunterston A |
| 27/01/11 | Graphite Pathfinder Project presentation to Ardrossan Community Council |
| 01/02/11 | SEPA at Hunterston A |
| 10/02/11 | Chris Kemp and Steve Griffiths, NII, on Site for Annual Review of Safety |

Summary

- Consultation has now closed on the NDA's draft Business Plan 2011–2014.
- Work has started on construction of a new £20 million nuclear research facility in Cumbria.
- Magnox North and Magnox South have completed their reintegration into Magnox Ltd.
- Berkeley site has sealed up its reactor buildings, marking a major milestone for the UK.
- The NDA Annual Report & Accounts were published in November.
- NDA-supported socio-economic projects for Wales were showcased at an event in Gwynedd.
- Two consortia were formally invited to participate in dialogue as the competition to appoint a new Parent Body Organisation for the Dounreay site moves forward.
- The restructure of the NDA is now complete following a comprehensive organisational review.
- NDA has welcomed the publication of an initial geological report for West Cumbria, which concludes that a number of areas in Copeland and Allerdale are unsuitable for a deep geological disposal facility (GDF) for nuclear waste.
- The NDA and URENCO Ltd have signed a set of non-binding commercial principles to support a potential transfer of the NDA-owned Capenhurst site to URENCO.
- Wylfa Power Station on Anglesey, owned by the NDA, is to continue generating electricity beyond December 2010 for up to two additional years.
- The NDA has appointed Mark Lesinski as Executive Director, Delivery, and David Batters as Chief Financial Officer.

Diary dates

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| • Plutonium options paper published by DECC | Shortly |
| • Publication of Disposal Safety Case System for GDF | Late February 2011 |
| • UK Radioactive Waste Inventory update | Early March 2011 |
| • Formal adoption of Business Plan 2011-2014 | Late March |
| • Formal adoption of Strategy II | Late March 2011 |

Consultation closes on Draft Business Plan

The eight-week consultation period on the NDA's draft Business Plan 2011–2014 is now closed. The document sets out the NDA's key objectives and the progress it expects to be made across its 19 sites over the next three years, in line with its recent funding settlement. Subject to approval by both the UK and Scottish Governments, the final version of the Business Plan will be published by the end of March 2011. Meanwhile, the final Strategy II will also be published at the end of March.

Work starts on research facility

Construction work has started on the foundations for a new £20 million nuclear research centre in West Cumbria. The Dalton Cumbrian Facility (DCF) is being constructed on the Westlakes Science and Technology Park, near Whitehaven, and is scheduled to open in September 2011. DCF will be a new research base for The University of Manchester's Dalton Nuclear Institute and is the result of joint investment by the University and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA). DCF is designed to expand the nuclear research and education capability of the UK's university sector and has the overall aim of delivering world-class nuclear research and transferring knowledge to industry.

Magnox reintegration

Magnox North and Magnox South have completed their reintegration into a single legal entity, named Magnox Ltd. The application to reintegrate was reviewed by the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate at the end of last year and their Chief Inspector granted the regulatory permission for the necessary relicensing at the beginning of this year. In the short term, the Magnox South and Magnox North groups will become separate business groups of Magnox Ltd. In the longer term, they will transition to three groups that better fit with their plans to take forward operations and decommissioning.

Reactor closure marks a first for UK

Berkeley site became the first commercial power station in the UK to seal up its reactors in a major decommissioning milestone. The two buildings were placed in a passive state, known as Safestore, and will be monitored and maintained until the site, near Bristol, is completely cleared in about 65 years' time. Berkeley Power Station, the first built in the UK to produce electricity commercially, came into service in 1962 and closed in 1989. The total power supplied over the operating life of the plant was 40 terawatt hours (Twh).

Annual Report & Accounts

The Annual Report, laid before Parliament in November, details strong performance against budget with revenue generation of £1.0 billion, exceeding target by £0.1 billion. Alongside the efforts to drive up revenues, there is a continued commitment to reducing costs and driving further efficiency in delivery of the NDA programme. This resulted in £0.2 billion savings in the year, enabling £2.7 billion of work to be delivered from the NDA's £2.5 billion budget.

Energy Minister, Charles Hendry said: "The NDA should be congratulated for seeking ways to improve the affordability of its programme whilst maintaining a focus on safety and tackling the highest hazards. It is also showing strong leadership by reducing its own costs, and in doing so setting a good example to its sites."

Welsh projects under the spotlight

Welsh Assembly politicians and local authority representatives gathered at Trawsfynydd site to highlight a series of NDA-supported projects aimed at providing an economic stimulus to the North Wales region. The projects contribute to the newly launched Meirionnydd Employment Plan which aims to address the challenges facing following the decline of some key industries, including the ongoing decommissioning of Trawsfynydd nuclear site.

Since 2005, NDA has invested more than £4 million in a wide range of North Wales socio-economic projects, of which around £2.5 million will benefit the Meirionnydd area specifically. The contributions have helped to leverage additional funding in the region of £12-14 million from various sources.

Dounreay competition moves ahead

The NDA issued its Invitation to Participate in Dialogue to the two consortia who successfully prequalified in the competition to appoint a Parent Body Organisation for the Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd (DSRL) Site Licence Company (SLC).

The consortia are:

- Babcock Dounreay Partnership: comprising Babcock Nuclear Services Ltd, CH2M Hill International Nuclear Services Ltd and URS International Holdings (UK) Ltd.
- Caithness Solutions: comprising Energy Solutions EU Ltd and Amec Nuclear Holdings Ltd.

Formal Dialogue is currently taking place over an anticipated 12 weeks, following a period of formal site information-gathering when the participants were given access to the Dounreay site and SLC personnel, reviewing information and visiting the site's key facilities and areas of work. This will assist them in the preparation of their final tender submission.

Organisational changes

The NDA completed its restructure following a comprehensive organisational review that started in January 2010. The changes include a 30% reduction in the number of NDA staff from 300 to 210, ambitious targets for generating commercial income from NDA assets, deferral of some non-critical site activity into future years and tough efficiency targets for Site Licence Companies.

West Cumbria geological report

NDA welcomed the publication of an initial geological report for West Cumbria, which concludes that a number of areas in Copeland and Allerdale are unsuitable for a deep geological disposal facility (GDF) for nuclear waste. The screening does not show where a facility would eventually be located, but, based on high-level geological exclusion criteria, is simply intended to avoid unnecessary work. Cumbrian Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) partnership is talking to Government about the siting process for a GDF and has published the report on its website.

Capenhurst transfer in pipeline

The NDA and URENCO Ltd signed a set of non-binding commercial principles to support a potential transfer of the NDA-owned Capenhurst site to URENCO. Formal discussions will now commence with an aim of achieving final agreement by mid-2011. The proposal would transfer the land and operations to URENCO under a long lease and services contract. This is anticipated to reduce NDA's net liabilities for managing and clearing the site, provide continued employment opportunities for the site workforce and pave the way for investment by URENCO, which occupies neighbouring facilities.

Wylfa powers on

Wylfa Power Station on Anglesey, owned by the NDA, is to continue generating electricity beyond December 2010 for up to two additional years. Site operator Magnox North has been undertaking work to support the period of extended generation over the last year, including an evaluation of the Periodic Safety Review – required every 10 years by the Health and Safety Executive's Nuclear Directorate to validate the safe and compliant operation of the site. The Environment Agency, which regulates other aspects of the site's work, had also been involved in this programme of work. Extended generation will be subject to the site continuing to meet rigorous operational and safety standards.

Executive Directors appointed

The NDA has appointed two new Executive Directors. Mark Lesinski is Executive Director, Delivery. Mark has over 30 years experience in the nuclear industry, holding senior roles in both the US and UK. He joins from Magnox South Ltd where he has been Managing Director since early 2008. David Batters has been appointed Chief Financial Officer. David, a Chartered Management Accountant, joins the NDA from BAE Systems where he has held a variety of roles over a 22-year period in the UK and overseas. His most recent role was Director of Group Mergers & Acquisitions.

Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group

SEPA Update on Hunterston A

HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING,

3 March 2011 at the Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan

Introduction

Several members of SEPA staff attended meetings with Magnox personnel to discuss progress with current programmes of work. The following report provides a summary of the principal topics addressed.

Graphite Pathfinder Project

A preliminary environmental safety case was submitted to SEPA in December 2010 for review. SEPA plans to provide a response to this document by 31 March 2011.

Two SEPA officers attended a workshop on 9 February which was held to provide a forum for detailed discussion of the work-plan envisaged for the project for the next 2 years.

This 'Pathfinder' project is being pursued in accordance with the 'near-site', 'near-surface' principles of the Scottish Government's published policy for the management of Higher Activity Radioactive Waste.

Review of options for dealing with CP7 compound contamination

Following the issuing of a Final Warning Letter to Magnox North Ltd in December 2010, SEPA has met with Magnox personnel on two occasions to be appraised of the effectiveness of the short-term measures that have been put in place to avoid a re-occurrence of the un-authorized release but also to discuss in detail the options for longer-term measures for achieving a permanent solution to the historic problem of CP7 compound contamination.

Whilst details of proposals for remedial work are yet to be finalised, applications have been submitted to SEPA requesting variations to be made to the current authorisation for disposal of solid low level waste (LLW). These variations are being requested to facilitate the disposal of increased volumes of LLW and use of an alternative disposal route for high volume very low level waste (HVLLW) from the site.

Annual Review of Safety

SEPA attended the Site's annual review of safety meeting on 10 February 2011.

The Safety Review report indicated that all disposals/discharges by authorised routes had been made well within the respective authorised limits. SEPA acknowledged reference to the issuing of the Final Warning Letter and welcomed the initiatives that are being taken to avoid a recurrence of the event.

Regarding the requirement for the disposal of solid LLW, the report highlighted the particular issue with the disposal of HVLLW from the site. This situation is being addressed by the recent submission of the application to SEPA seeking a variation to the current authorisation for disposal of solid LLW.

With respect to gaseous disposal facilities, SEPA acknowledges the revised date of 31 March 2011 for completion of the upgrade of the stack monitoring facilities.

Regarding liquid effluent disposals, the report indicated the progress that had been achieved with the inactive and active commissioning of the Modular Active Effluent Treatment Plant (MAETP). SEPA, following receipt of reports on Operational Safety and Best Practicable Means, released the regulatory schedule hold point permitting the discharge of miscellaneous active effluent via the MAETP. Discharge



of cartridge cooling pond water via the MAETP requires SEPA approval and the Safety Report indicated that documentation in support of this requirement is in the course of preparation.

Ian Robertson
Specialist 1 – Radioactive Substances Operations Unit



HM Nuclear Installations Inspectorate

Hunterston A

Site Stakeholder Group

Quarterly Report for 1 October to 31 December 2010

Foreword

This report is issued as part of the Health and Safety Executive's commitment to make information about inspection and regulatory activities relating to the above site available to the public. It is for distribution to members of the Hunterston A Site Stakeholder Group (SSG) and covers activities associated with the regulation of safety at Hunterston A. These reports are distributed quarterly and are also available on the HSE's website at <http://www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/llic/index.htm>. Site Inspectors of HM Nuclear Installations Inspectorate normally attend SSG meetings and will be happy to respond to any questions raised there or subsequently by members of the SSG. Any other person wishing to inquire about matters covered by this report should contact the HSE's Nuclear Directorate on 0151 951 3484/3290.

Nuclear Directorate
Health and Safety Executive
Redgrave Court
Merton Road
Bootle
Merseyside
L20 7HS

INSPECTIONS

The Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII) made inspections on the following dates during the quarter:

- 13–14 October
- 24–25 November

ROUTINE MATTERS

Inspections are undertaken at site as part of the process for monitoring compliance with:

- (i) the conditions attached by HSE/NII to the nuclear site licence;
- (ii) the Health and Safety at Work etc Act (HSWA) 1974; and
- (iii) regulations made under the HSWA, for example the Ionising Radiations Regulations 1999 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999.

This entails monitoring licensee's actions on the site in relation to incidents, operations, maintenance, projects, modifications, safety case changes and any other matters which may affect safety. The licensee is required to make and implement adequate arrangements under the conditions attached to the licence in order to ensure legal compliance. Inspections seek to judge both the adequacy of these arrangements and their implementation.

In this period routine inspections of Hunterston A covered arrangements for the periodic review of safety cases.

In general the arrangements made and implemented by the licensee in response to safety requirements were deemed to be adequate in the areas inspected. However, where improvements were considered necessary, satisfactory commitments to address the issues were made by or are being sought from the licensee, and the site inspector will monitor progress during future visits. Where necessary, formal regulatory enforcement action will be taken to ensure that appropriate remedial measures are implemented to reasonably practicable timescales.

NON-ROUTINE MATTERS

Licensees are required to have arrangements to respond to non-routine matters and events. NII inspectors judge the adequacy of the licensee's response including actions taken to implement any necessary improvements. There were no items of particular note during the reporting period.

Visit by NII Senior Staff: In October Colin Patchett, HM Deputy Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations for civil nuclear power stations, visited the site. He saw the main nuclear plants, met the management team and safety representatives, and discussed the site's safety performance and plans for future decommissioning.

PSR: a team from NII visited the site as part of our assessment of the safety case for internal hazards, such as fire, in the licensee's Periodic Safety Review.

Emergency Preparedness: the licensee is required to make arrangements for dealing with any accident or emergency arising on the site. At Hunterston A NII observes an exercise of these arrangements at least annually. A meeting was held to review the performance at the 2010 exercise, discuss progress on the actions that arose from it, and plan for the 2011 exercise. The meeting was held jointly with Chapelcross and Trawsfynydd, to allow lessons to be shared across the licensee's three sites that are in the process of defuelling and decommissioning.

Less frequently, exercises are held to test plans made by the operator and the local authority for the most serious accidents. In December Exercise Kilmory took place, based on a notional accident on the Hunterston A site. The Hunterston Strategic Coordination Centre at Prestwick airport was set up, as was the licensee's Central Emergency Support Centre at Barnwood in Gloucester.

Safety Representatives: the site inspector held a periodic meeting with Safety Representatives, to support their function of representing employees and receiving information on matters affecting their health, safety, and welfare at work.

Graphite Pathfinder Project: following the briefing reported in the last quarter, Magnox North met a larger team from NII to discuss the Graphite Pathfinder Project, which is examining the feasibility of near-surface disposal of graphite waste on or near the site.

Site Stakeholder Group: NII attended the six-monthly meeting of the Site Stakeholder Group (which deals also with Hunterston B).

REGULATORY ACTIVITY

Under Health and Safety legislation NII Site Inspectors, and other HSE Inspectors, may issue formal documents to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements. Under nuclear site licence conditions HSE/NII issues regulatory documents, which either permission an activity or require some form of action to be taken; these are collectively termed Licence Instruments (LI). In addition inspectors may issue enforcement notices to secure improvements to safety.

No Licence Instruments or enforcement notices were issued during the quarter.

TRANSFORMING OUR BUSINESS

HSE's Nuclear Directorate (ND) continues work on a programme of change entitled 'Transformation' which is intended to help ND realise its aim of becoming recognised as a world-class regulator. Over the coming months, ND's focus will include improving the way it engages with all of its stakeholders, including communities around nuclear licensed sites, to explain the work that it does and the regulatory decisions it makes.

ND will keep stakeholders fully informed of changes and any decisions that are made through channels including:

The HSE Nuclear eBulletin (visit www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/ebulletin to subscribe);

Site stakeholder group and local liaison committee reports;

ND's newly relaunched website (www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear).

If you have any comments, questions or suggestions regarding ND's Transformation programme, please get in touch by emailing NDenquiries@hse.gsi.gov.uk.

28 January 2011