

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 try 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 Philips 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 Philips 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