

**MagOLDBURY ON SEVERN POWER STATION  
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE CONFERENCE CENTRE  
ON WEDNESDAY 18 JANUARY 2012**

**PRESENT:**

Mr M Lynden (in the chair)	-	Oldbury on Severn Parish Council
Cllr R Birch	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Cllr C Evers	-	Glos Assn of Parish and Town Councils
Rev B Goodwin		
Cllr R Griffin	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Dr L Hales		
Cllr P Hassell	-	Bristol City Council
Cllr M Hawkins	-	Aust Parish Council
Cllr G Vaughan-Lewis	-	Alkington Parish Council
Cllr Ms J Lyons	-	Olveston Parish Council
Mr J McNally	-	Staff Representative
Cllr J O'Neill	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Cllr Mrs P Parsloe	-	Thornbury Town Council
Cllr M Pruett	-	Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Council
Cllr B Willcox	-	Alveston Parish Council
Mr D Wride	-	Lower Severn Drainage Board
Cllr Mrs P Wride	-	Chair, Berkeley SSG
Cllr Ms V Tutin	-	Olveston Parish Council

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Dr M Ghannad	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Mr M Lester	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Dr R MacGregor	-	Environment Agency
Mr J Jenkin	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Ms G Ellis-King	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Mr D Haigh	-	Dept for Communities and Local Govt
Mr M Heaton	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mrs A Chapman	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mrs E Vaughan-Lewis	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr B Guy	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mr A Jones	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms L Jones	-	Wylfa Power Station
Ms L Hutchinson		
Ms M Sauvebois		
Mr M J Davis (Secretary)		

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

- 1 Mr Lynden welcomed everyone to this meeting of the Oldbury on Severn Site Stakeholder Group.

## **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 2 Apologies for absence were received from Dr P Sprague, Cllr C Clifford, Mr M Johnson, Mr J Kempster, Mr P Kennedy, Mr B S Kirk, Mr M Pratt, Cllr M Riddle, and Ms H Thomas.

## **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

### **(a) Accuracy**

- 3 The minutes of the SSG Meeting held on 2 November 2011 and the minutes of the Joint meeting with the Berkeley Site SSG and the Socio-Economic Sub-Group meeting held on the same date were approved as accurate records.

### **(b) Matters arising**

- 4 There were no matters arising from the minutes of previous meetings.

## **PUBLIC FORUM**

- 5 Mr Lynden invited members of the public to raise any issues which might not otherwise be discussed under subsequent agenda items. No issues were raised.

## **QUARTER 3 REPORTS**

### **Nuclear Decommissioning Authority**

- 9 An update on current NDA issues had been circulated to members. Mr Jenkin drew attention to the following issues:
- (i) A stakeholder survey had been circulated to members of the Group. Mr Jenkin encouraged members to complete and return these.
  - (ii) The NDA had published its Draft Business Plan for 2012-15. Consultation on this document would last until 3 February.
  - (iii) A document on integrated waste management was also currently the subject of consultation which would end on 24 February.
  - (iv) The NDA Chief Executive, Mr Fountain, had now left his post. Mr Batters was acting in that capacity until a successor was appointed.
  - (v) A national stakeholder event had been held in Manchester and had provided effective feedback to the NDA.
  - (vi) A preferred bidder had been identified in the competition to take ownership of Dounreay Site Restoration Limited. Negotiations would continue with the aim of transferring shares to the new parent body organisation in April 2012. Engagement with the market in relation to

the competition for the Magnox sites was expected to commence during the coming months.

10 During discussion the following points were noted:

- (i) In reply to a question from Mr Lynden, Mr Heaton said that the NDA's competition process was unlikely to be of concern to staff at Oldbury as there were only two employees of Energy Solutions at the site, all of the others were Magnox employees.
- (ii) In reply to a question from Cllr Birch, Mr Jenkin confirmed that the final selection of the preferred bidder for the Dounreay competition had been from two consortia.
- (iii) In reply to comments from Dr Hales, Mr Jenkin accepted that the provision of a geological disposal facility had been under discussion for a good number of years. He said that progress had been made in recent years in relation to the selection of containers for eventual disposal at the facility and one community so far had volunteered as a host location. Cllr Hancock commented that one community had volunteered to host the facility whereas he understood that some 30% of the country had geological conditions which could be considered suitable.
- (iv) Cllr Mrs Wride outlined the arrangements which were being made for the removal of the former power station boilers from the Berkeley site and their transport by road to Sharpness from where they would be taken via Portbury Dock to Sweden for recycling. Mr Heaton explained that the Oldbury power station boilers were located within the concrete pressure vessel.
- (v) Cllr Hassell suggested that it would be helpful if future monthly update reports from the NDA could give the full website address for the identified links.

### **Site Director's Report**

11 On behalf of Dr Sprague, Mr Heaton presented a report on current activities at the Oldbury power station site, drawing particular attention to the following:

- (i) A decision had been taken to cease generation from Reactor 1 at the end of February. With Reactor 2 having been shut down in June 2011 this would bring generation at the site to an end after 44 years.
- (ii) Preparations were being made for the activities which would be required on site following the end of generation. Some of these activities would require regulatory approval. Defuelling was likely to commence during the latter half of 2012 and was expected to take two years to complete; during that time it was planned that 2-3 flasks of irradiated fuel would be transported from site each week. Personnel from the station had visited

Sizewell A to observe progress being made with post-generation activities.

- (iii) The site's emergency arrangements would remain unchanged for the time being. Eventually, as the potential hazards on the site reduced, the emergency arrangements would be reviewed and, subject to regulatory approval, simplified.
  - (iv) Cessation of generation would reduce requirements for manpower on the site. A reduction of some 100 personnel was envisaged over the coming two years. The station management team was working with trades unions and individuals to ensure that as far as possible the aspirations of individual members of staff were met.
  - (v) Reactor 1 continued to operate well, producing some 150 MW of electricity. The programme of inter-reactor transfers of fuel was now complete and Reactor 1 had sufficient fuel for its remaining operation. Electricity generation during the current financial year had already exceeded 1 TWh; it was hoped that total production for the year would reach 1.4 TWh by the end of February.
  - (vi) Samples of graphite were to be removed from the Reactor 2 core using a large sample trepanning machine. Analysis of these samples would provide additional support for continued operation at Wylfa until 2014.
  - (vii) During January the site had passed two years without a lost time accident to any staff, agency or contractors' employees working at Oldbury.
  - (viii) The station had reported to the Environment Agency circumstances in which non-radioactive liquid effluent discharges from the site had exceeded relevant limits for a short period of time.
- 12 In reply to a question from Mr Lynden, Mr Heaton explained how the samples of graphite removed from the Reactor 2 core were to be used to support assessments of the effects of irradiation on the graphite reactor cores at Wylfa Power Station
- 13 Cllr Hassell asked how long after the end of generation the station would require its substantial standby generators. Mr Guy said he anticipated that there would be no change in the site's standby generation requirements for at least a few years.
- 14 In reply to a question from Rev Goodwin, Mr Heaton said that appropriate arrangements would be made to mark the final shutdown of Reactor 1 at the end of February. These arrangements would not be allowed to distract the operating staff who were responsible for shutting down the reactor safely.
- 15 Dr Hales asked whether arrangements were in place to retain necessary skills and knowledge when staff numbers were being reduced. Mr Heaton said that the retention of key skills was a familiar issue for the power station management.

Various approaches were adopted including arrangements for former employees to assist when required.

- 16 Cllr Pruett asked whether it might be possible for members of Severn Beach Parish Council to visit the power station. Mr Heaton undertook to discuss this further with Cllr Pruett.

### **Office for Nuclear Regulation**

- 17 Dr Ghannad reported on his activities as ONR Site Inspector for Oldbury, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) Reactor 1 had continued to operate within the conditions of its graphite safety case; the programme of transfer of fuel between the reactors had been completed and no safety issues had been raised during the past quarter. Reactor 1 was to be shut down finally at the end of February.
  - (ii) Following its shutdown last year, the temperature of Reactor 2 was currently approximately 66°. This compared to an operating temperature of 365°.
  - (iii) The Office for Nuclear Regulation would in due course assess a proposed post operation and defuelling safety case.
  - (iv) No issues had been raised by a recent inspection of fire safety arrangements.
- 18 In response to comments from Mr Lynden, Dr Ghannad outlined the reviews and reports completed in the light of the Fukushima accident. He said that the reviews had not identified any major safety issues but all issues raised would be considered to establish whether improvements could be made. The implementation of agreed recommendations would be monitored.
- 19 In reply to a question from Dr Hales, Dr Ghannad said that the generic design assessment of reactor types for future construction had reached the point where the regulators had given interim acceptance of the design principles; a number of identified outstanding issues had yet to be resolved but agreement had been reached on how those issues would be addressed. Dr McGregor drew attention to the information on the generic design assessment available on the EA and HSE websites.

### **Environment Agency**

- 20 Dr MacGregor presented a report from the Environment Agency, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) He outlined the regulatory framework and identified issues relating to activities at the station which had been addressed during the past quarter.

- (ii) Reports from the Station on liquid and gaseous discharges to the environment and the Agency's assessments of those reports were placed on public register. These discharges were well within the permitted limits and no notification levels had been exceeded during the period.
  - (iii) In reply to a comment from Dr Hales, Dr MacGregor said that the non-radioactive liquid effluent discharge referred to earlier by Mr Heaton was regulated by another branch of the Agency.
- 21 Cllr Evers drew attention to the comment in the Environment Agency report on assessments of direct radiation from the Oldbury and Berkeley sites. The report referred to a substantial (80%) reduction in the assessment due to changes in the way in which these assessments were undertaken. Mrs Chapman explained the difficulty in carrying out these assessments with radiation at low levels and close to natural background; the results of the new method were considered to be more realistic although they were based on appropriately pessimistic assumptions.

### **REPORT FROM NUCLEAR COMMUNITY MEETING**

- 22 Mr Lynden reported on a "Nuclear Communities: listen and be heard" meeting which he had attended at the Colston Hall, Bristol on 9 November. He said that he had been disappointed by the fact that the audience appeared to contain very few members of communities local to nuclear power stations and he had been surprised by the level of bias towards anti-nuclear views displayed by the audience and most of the speakers.

### **REPORT FROM THE NSG MEETING**

- 23 Cllr Hawkins reported on the NDA national event for stakeholders which had been held recently in Manchester; the event had been attended by representatives from each of the site stakeholder groups. Issues discussed at the meeting had included progress made by the NDA in reducing its costs, the priority given to activities at Sellafield, the removal of the Berkeley boilers, and the cessation of generation at Oldbury. He said that attention had also been drawn to issues relating to site restoration strategy. He felt that it was important that the views of this Group were taken into account in preparing site restoration plans, having regard for changes which had occurred since the earlier work on site end state had been completed.
- 24 Mr Lynden agreed that it was appropriate now for this group to reconsider the work which it has undertaken earlier on the preferred end state for the Oldbury power station site. He proposed to convene a meeting of a small sub-committee of members to review the earlier work and report back at the next or possibly the subsequent meeting of this Group. Members supported this proposal.

### **REPORT FROM THE ONR MEETING**

- 25 Cllr Hawkins reported on a meeting convened by the Office for Nuclear Regulation which he had attended in Bristol. The purpose of the meeting had been to outline the results of the reviews undertaken in the light of the

Fukushima accident. He said that the information had been well presented and it had been made clear that the serious damage at the Fukushima plant had not been caused by the earthquake but by the subsequent tsunami and flood which had inundated the sea defences. He said he had been very disappointed that the meeting had been attended by only 11 people.

## **RESPONSE TO THE WEIGHTMAN REPORT**

- 26 Mr Guy outlined the actions taken at Oldbury in support of the various reviews initiated in the light of the Fukushima accident. He said that the work had identified potential (if unlikely) events and sensible practical steps which might be taken to mitigate the effects of these events. Examples of issues considered included the protection from flooding of essential equipment held on the site and the potential implications of staff having difficulty in getting to site if surrounding areas were flooded. He explained the significant differences between the Magnox plant and plants of other designs which meant that a much simpler, more pragmatic approach could be adopted towards maintaining an effective backup feed system in the event of problems with normal systems.
- 27 Mr Guy said that the work undertaken at the station had enabled responses to be given to all of the issues raised in the Weightman report. He outlined the various recommendations addressed to the industry and the regulators.
- 28 In reply to a question from Cllr Birch, Mr Guy said he had been surprised to find that the height of the sea defences provided at Fukushima had been approximately half of the height of the tsunami which had been experienced on this occasion and significantly lower than the height of other tsunamis experienced within living memory.
- 29 Cllr Griffin suggested that it might be helpful to seek ideas from the military in relation to their approach to contingency planning and dealing with unusual and unforeseen circumstances.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 30 Mr Lynden said he had recently seen a report that the 50th anniversary of the government's decision to build Oldbury power station had recently been passed.

## **DATE TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 31 It was noted that the next meeting of this Group was scheduled to be held on 18 April 2012 at the Oldbury Conference Centre at 6.00 for 7.00pm

MJD  
24 January 2012