

## Site Stakeholder Group Land Quality Subgroup

**THE THIRD SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP LAND QUALITY SUBGROUP MEETING  
HELD ON MONDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2008 AT HUNTERSTON A SITE.**

### **Present**

#### **Hunterston A Site**

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

#### **Site Stakeholder Subgroup**

Mr Kenny MacDougall (Chair)  
Mr John Robertson  
Mrs Rita Holmes  
Mr Frank Craig  
Mr Peter MacFarlane  
Mr Ivor Roscoe  
Mr Angus Cochran-Patrick

#### **In attendance**

Mr Duncan Jackson (Enviros)  
Hugh Richards (via telephone)

### **1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS**

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

Apologies were given for Mr John Lamb, Mrs Kerry McMillan, and Mr Lee Talbot.

### **2. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

Mr Jon Dolphin informed the group that he wished to answer some of the questions raised at the previous subgroup meeting. Various maps and information handouts were made available to the group.

With regards to coastline changes, Mr Dolphin explained that the diagrams provided showed how the coastline has changed over the years in terms of erosion and coastal deposits.

Another issue which Mr Dolphin wished to clarify was the effect tidal flow and storm occurrences would have on the coastal defences and in turn the Very Low Level Waste Pits (VLLWP). Mr Dolphin stated the current coastal defences, completed in March 2008, are robust and have a 10 year design life. In 2013/14 the Site will look at upgrading these defences to a 100 year design life, thus ensuring the VLLWP are not affected in the future. The current defences are monitored every six months via a laser survey of foreshore which produces an accurate and detailed review while being able to pick up on any movement of boulder arrangements. This enables the Site to ensure the current defences are doing their job correctly.

Mr MacDougall asked how the Clydeport Docks development plans would affect the coastal defences. Mr Dolphin informed the group that North Ayrshire Council had been contacted and

at present no plans had been submitted. Mr MacDougall said that the new draft local plan will announce Clydeport's development plans for the forthcoming ten years.

Mr MacDougall referred the conversation to the sub sea erosion at Little Briggard. Mr Cochran-Patrick commented that the Hunterston Estate supplied maps from 1857 - 1957 which showed very little change in the low water mark, however from 1957 - 1997 there was a substantial change. Mr Saunders said that the Site commissioned some modelling studies, carried out by ERM, a couple of years ago with a schematic study of the coast, and this was built into their model. Now that the work for the 10 year design life has been completed, the 100 year design life will be implemented in the next six or seven years.

With regards to historical land drains, Mr Saunders concluded that certain land drains have no significance in terms of drainage as site developments mean they have been removed. Drains which still exist however will be taken into account.

Mr Dolphin was concerned that the actual role of the subgroup was somewhat vague during the last meeting, however he confirmed this concern had been addressed through referring to the SSG constitution. He added that the Land Quality Project provides information to the subgroup in a clear and concise manner, which is then fed back into the main SSG and also the local communities. As a result, Mr Dolphin requested that the subgroup give feedback at the end of each meeting stating if they are happy or content with what information has been presented to them. Mr Cochran-Patrick said it would be more applicable for the group to state if they are happy with progress made to date, that way any outstanding questions can be taken away prior to the next meeting and fed back accordingly.

Mr Craig asked what structures the coastal defences had been made from. Mr Ashburn replied that the defences are rock from a local quarry, which are design engineered by Halcrows. Mr Ashburn added that weekly inspections are carried out and no levels of contamination have been found.

Mrs Holmes asked what decision had been made with regards to dealing with the VLLWP long term. Mr Dolphin explained that proposals have been made to the NDA, and subject to funding, re-landscaping will be implemented, with the pits coped in a geotextile. If the money is not forthcoming, then monitoring will continue in the short term until a solution is found. Mr Dolphin added that while work is scheduled for the financial year 2010/11, the project is high on the agenda. With this in mind, the project team hope to complete the work after April 2009. For this to be possible, the project plan needs to be submitted to the NDA before the end of December, which must then be ratified before funding can be granted to implement the work next year. Mr Dolphin continued that reinforcement of the coastal defences is a long term issue which the NDA are aware of, scheduled for 2013/14, with a 100 year design life to be looked at thereafter.

Mrs Holmes commented that she would prefer the stronger reinforcement to be used now the option of leaving the VLLWP had been decided. Mr Dolphin assured her that there is no quality issue with the defences, reiterating they have a 10 year design life. Mr Richards added that should a storm event occur the pits would not be immediately taken into the sea, therefore a limited period of time would be available to repair and accelerate the reinforcement of the coastal defences. Mr MacDougall stated it was his understanding that these current defences were at the lowest end of the weight scale. Mr Richards confirmed that the reinforcement would require heavier blocks.

Mr Robertson questioned why the Site spent money on only a 10 year plan, claiming man hours were wasted and the minimum design life should have been 30 years. Mr Dolphin replied that while funding was an issue, the current design is sufficient for this moment and time.

At this point Mr Roscoe wished to state that he was comfortable with the statements which had been made regarding the 100 year design life of the coastal defence.

Mr MacFarlane asked if the defences were all graded the same size. Mr Ashburn explained that there were lines of defence in terms of weight and size. Heavy rocks were at the base, with lighter ones at the top. Every rock has been placed into position.

### **3 LAND QUALITY MANAGEMENT PRESENTATION: STRATEGIC OPTIONS ASSESSMENT ON ZONES E AND H.**

The Land Quality Project team then presented the strategic options assessment on zones E and E to the group, and invited any question.

Mr Dolphin took an action to provide paperwork at the next subgroup meeting giving examples of what exactly is involved in the above works.

Mr MacDougall asked if the relevant waste would be removed to a landfill site. Mr Phillips replied that if it was low level waste, it would go to Drigg, however if it was high volume very low level waste then it would go to an authorised landfill site.

Mr MacDougall and other members of the subgroup agreed that the presentation and information given was far too complicated, stating they did not understand the strategic options process. An example of how the project team finalised the scores on paper was recommended for the next meeting.

Mrs Holmes asked why the score for workforce safety was so low. Mr Phillips explained that the workforce are in an industry which they are familiar with, and where the work is very much controlled in terms of risk assessments and procedures. Effectively the workforce are doing a job which they have volunteered to do and are familiar with.

Mr Roscoe asked what the fastest option would be. Mr Dolphin confirmed that the fastest option, while satisfying SEPA, would be option four, which stops the immediate problem by through early in-situ remediation and deferred clean-up to SoLA exempt levels.

Mr Cochran-Patrick asked what the half life of caesium 137 was. Mr Ashburn confirmed it was 30 years. The remaining 25% of waste is made up of strontium 90, pritium, and cobalt 60 amongst others.

Mr Dolphin concluded that the next step is for the Land Quality project team to present the preferred option to the Site Lead Team and SEPA. The feedback from both these meetings will then be reported back to the subgroup at the next meeting. As members of the subgroup were not comfortable with what had been presented, Mr Dolphin also took an action to produce a clearer presentation of the steps taken during the optioneering strategy, including a full account of how the scores were decided. A mock example detailing the whole weighting and scoring process will also be considered.



Mrs Holmes wished for clarification at the next subgroup meeting as to what the differences were between options 2A and 1B.

**4 MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY SUBGROUP ON 20 NOVEMBER 2008**

It was decided that a statement would be made at the main SSG meeting explaining what the CP7 compound is, the relevant issues which have been outlined, and that the project team are continuing to explore an optioneering process to determine the best way forward.

**5 Q&A**

There were no further questions at this point, and Mr MacDougall closed the meeting upon thanking all those for their attendance.

**Mr Kenny MacDougal**  
**SSG Vice Chairman**