

Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group

**THE TWENTY-SIXTH HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, 8 DECEMBER 2011 IN THE BRISBANE HOUSE HOTEL, LARGS**

Present:

Magnox Ltd

Mr Tony Bale (Chair)
Mr Reuben Phillips
Mr Peter Roach

Community Councillors

Mr John Lamb - West Kilbride
Mrs Rita Holmes – Fairlie (Vice Chair)

Community Council Representatives

Mr Douglas MacFarlane (Largs)

Councillors

Cllr Robert Barr
Cllr Elizabeth McLardy
Cllr Alex Gallagher

In Attendance

Mrs Shelagh Milligan, Magnox Ltd
Mr Derek Rooney, Magnox Ltd
Mr Allan McRae, CNC

EDF Energy

Mr Colin Weir

NDA

Mr David Rushton
Dr Adrian Simper

ONR

Mr Mark Tyrer

Hunterston Estate

Mr Angus Cochran-Patrick

Several members of the public were also in attendance

Apologies:

Mr Chris Kemp, Mr William Jack, Mr Ian Frame, Mr Ewan Young, Mr Jonathan Jenkin, Mr Stuart McGhie, Mrs Claire Cook, Mr Alan Rice, Mr John Reid, Mr Kenny MacDougall, Mr Hugh McGhee, Mr Keith Hammond, Ms Melanie Coulter.

1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Chairman, Mr Tony Bale welcomed everyone to the 26th meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group (SSG).

2. CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR UPDATES/CORRESPONDENCE

Mr Bale advised that additional correspondence had been received from the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR), regarding community briefings around Fukushima and the associated responses.

In addition, Mr Bale advised that as the meeting progressed, he would provide an update on the Chair and Vice Chair's recent activities on behalf of the SSG.

3. ACTIONS/APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Mrs Rita Holmes made reference to the previous minutes (page 4), and a reference to the word “plant”. She advised that this should have been “plan”. On continuing, (page 8), “Mr Stubbs advised that with regard to national matters linked to Hunterston A, Mr Ewan Young from the Scottish Government was in attendance and had been involved in activity of a higher implementation strategy”. Mrs Holmes commented that this did not make sense. Mr Roach responded that this should have read “the implementation strategy for higher activity waste”. In addition, (page 9, part 6B), “The NDA had invited Sellafield to propose a suitable plant to close” and enquired if this was correct. Mr Peter Roach responded that this was perhaps a misinterpretation and could therefore be deleted. **(Action 01)**

Mr Bale proposed that an “action list” be compiled at the end of the minutes for ease of reference at future meetings. **(Action 02)**

In relation to previous actions, Mr Bale advised that a discussion had taken place with the Chapelcross SSG Chair to establish their interest in attending an ONR regional event. This proposed event would provide question and answering opportunities with regards to the final report on the Japanese earthquake and tsunami. A request for a meeting had subsequently been requested from ONR and Mr Bale was awaiting response.

Mr Hugh McGhee was not in attendance therefore it was agreed to discuss his action at the next meeting in March 2012. **(Action 03)**

In the absence of Mr Mark Stubbs, Mr Peter Roach explained that the information requested at the previous SSG meeting was presented at Hunterston A Site in a series of presentations during October 2011 and could therefore consider the relevant actions complete.

Mr Bale made reference to an action upon himself regarding a meeting on 19 September 2011 between Magnox and the NDA to discuss a business case for graphite disposal. Mr Bale advised however that he was not part of any discussions with the NDA and enquired if Mr Roach could provide an update. Mr Roach responded that the feedback requested had subsequently been included within the aforementioned presentations given at Hunterston A in October; and that consequently, this action was complete.

There were no further amendments noted and the minutes of 8 September 2011 were subsequently approved.

4. SOCIO-ECONOMIC SUBGROUP UPDATE

Mr Bale advised that, at the most recent socio-economic sub-group meeting, a number of projects were considered for NDA funding. These projects were discussed at length and scored with final recommendations. These recommendations were thereafter presented to the Council where consent was given. Consequently, the purpose of today’s discussion would be to finalise the projects.

Mr Bale stated that five projects had been nominated in an attempt to secure an imminent win:

1. Millport Marine Biology Centre
2. North Ayrshire Sectorial Academy
3. Ayrshire Key Funding

4. Ardrossan Quayside Office Redevelopment (via Irvine Bay)
5. Tourism Growth

In addition, Mr Bale advised that the Hall Aitken Report had successfully been submitted to the NDA - a further tool highlighting that North Ayrshire should be considered a high priority area within the NDA's Socio-Economic Policy.

In addition, Mr Bale advised that feedback on each project's progression would be issued to the SSG, with a timescale for forwarding to the NDA. Thereafter, each success rate would be monitored. Mr Bale stated that they had in fact requested that North Ayrshire Council have the projects in draft form for discussion at today's meeting. Cllr Alex Gallagher confirmed that although the requested deadline was correct, it could however be considered unrealistic to have five business cases submitted within this timescale. He did agree however that pressure should continue to ensure that requested deadlines were achieved. Cllr Gallagher offered to take this matter up with the Council's Planning and Development Departments.

Mr Bale advised that he would be requesting a quarterly update from all of the aforementioned projects in the New Year to monitor how each project is progressing. **(Action 04)**

Mr Bale requested formal approval of the proposed projects, which were subsequently proposed and seconded.

Cllr Gallagher raised concern with the process of obtaining new projects from other sources which he felt was unclear and made reference to an unsuccessful submission which had not been "worked up" properly. Cllr Gallagher therefore suggested that new requests be obtained via additional sources such as the local community or other suitable alternatives.

Finally, Mr Bale highlighted that a private project had been submitted and it was hoped that more would be forthcoming. Mrs Rita Holmes proposed if one of the projects were to be successful, perhaps Magnox Ltd could offer publicity, which might assist further submissions. Mr Roach added that if the SSG required assistance with communication, he would ensure that this was provided. He wished to raise concern however with establishing a process and criteria for advising potential financial assistance to the local community to ensure that expectations were not raised, and made reference to previous instances involving headlines within the local newspapers such as the 'Magnox Millions'.

Mrs Holmes raised concern by referring to the new Socio-Economic Development Plan from the NDA. On the rear of the report it stated that there would be three thresh-holds for funding; for up to £10k, "applications would be considered by a local site panel" and enquired if this statement was referring to the SSG. Mr Roach responded that he was unsure, however advised that the Magnox initiative was a new and emerging, broader initiative on how they were going to deal with funding across 10 sites, not just at Hunterston A. The purpose of involving a panel was to include local communities and professionals, however he was unsure whether he could use the same format.

Mrs Holmes made reference to the new financial year, enquiring whether the NDA would give the SSG socio-economic sub-group control over how the money would be distributed within the community. In response, Mr Roach advised that the aim of Magnox Ltd and the NDA was to optimise the usage of funds throughout the UK with some groups having a greater need than others. Consequently, on occasions a decision may be made not to spread funds too thinly but alternatively to focus on one area. Mr Roach stated that in his opinion, there may be

a Magnox panel who would be taking recommendations from the SSG and making judgements, however they would be making judgements across 10 sites, not just one.

Mrs Holmes requested further clarification on funding from £10k to £100k and raised concerns that this would not be presented before the SSG or a site panel at all. Mr Roach responded that it may come via an outsource. Mrs Holmes reiterated that she had concerns with the NDA renegeing on their responsibility regarding socio-economic funding by handing over the reigns to Magnox and other site licensing companies.

At this point in the discussion, Mr Derek Rooney advised that a Magnox employee would give a presentation at the meeting in March 2012, highlighting the new funding process and what changes were being made.

5A. HUNTERSTON B SITE REPORT

Mr Colin Weir took the B Station report as read and wished to highlight some key points. He stated that the station's safety performance had shown no lost-time accidents during the period, resulting in over three and a half years since the previous lost-time accident. He added that this excellent safety record was testament to the station and its contract partners who were committed to achieving and sustaining the goal of "zero harm". Mr Weir confirmed that the station had completed the year without any events on site and that this was an impressive achievement considering only three sites within the fleet were able to achieve this.

The "Active Force Statutory Outage" took place from July 2011 to August 2011 and considering there were circa 1200-1300 staff on site, once again, safety was key priority. During the outage project, a safety team was formed to focus on the management of safety during the outage period. The outage was completely successful and the plant returned to service on 9 September 2011. Safety statistics recorded during the outage were excellent and once again there were zero lost-time accidents, zero nuclear report, zero environmental events, zero fire events and zero recordable contamination events.

In September 2011, representatives from Hunterston B were presented with the "Ospar Order of Distinction Award 2011", an award that recognises 15 consecutive gold medals. Mr Weir noted however that B Station had in fact achieved 18 consecutive gold medals.

With regards to environmental safety, Mr Weir advised that there had been no environmental events for the period. There had however been two occasions within the period which were discussed with SEPA. The first involved a spillage on site which involved a small quantity of slightly radioactive oil during transportation of one of the oil drums. This was subsequently cleaned up and, as an additional precaution, the surface section of the roadway affected by the spillage was removed and relayed. A thorough monitoring process confirmed that no activity was lost to the environment.

The second situation involved a leak from a tank containing ammonia (which is a non-radioactive chemical used in the water treatment plant). The material was retained in a purpose bund and recovered by a tanker. Once again, there was no loss to the environment.

Mr Weir advised that within the period, SEPA had carried out two site inspections regarding the arrangements for discharges under the Radioactive Substance Act. There were no significant new issues identified on either of the inspections.

There were no significant issues regarding collective or individual radiation exposure during the quarter and no reportable radiological protection events had occurred. An event occurred involving a radiography source, which did not retract into its shielded source container. Contingency plans were effectively implemented and the source retrieved resulting in no personal exposure. This was another unreported event.

Generation – R3 TG7 – In August, the unit operated continuously on optimum power. In September 2011, the unit operated continuously on optimum power from the start of the month until 19 September 2011 when the output was reduced due to a cooling water pipe leak. The unit was taken out and serviced on 20 September 2011 to allow repair of the cooling water pipe to take place. In October 2011, the cooling water pipe work was repaired and the unit returned to service on 4 October 2011, full load was obtained from 6 October 2011, which remained and operated at this level.

R4 TG8 – In August, the unit was on statutory outage. The unit returned from statutory outage on 9 September 2011 and achieved normal full load by 12 September 2011. The unit operated on full load until the 19 September 2011 when the load was reduced due to the cooling water pipe leak on R3. The unit continued at reduced load until 26 September 2011 when it was returned to normal full load and this continued for the remainder of the month. In October 2011, the unit operated continuously on optimum power.

Mr Weir advised that a report had been issued on “The Socio-Economic Impact of a Nuclear Power Station on your Doorstep” and made reference to the figures carried out for Torness. Mr Weir advised that he had reviewed Hunterston statistics as a comparison and these were in line with Torness. The total local spend in their area in the last year was over £80m in total.

Mr Weir highlighted that over 350 members of the public answered the open invitation to visit the nuclear power plant and visitors were on site at Hunterston B on 18 September 2011.

Post Fukushima investigations indicated that the UK nuclear fleet was robust and Mr Weir stated that he welcomed Dr Weightman’s reaffirmation that UK nuclear facilities had no fundamental safety issues or weaknesses.

Mr Weir advised that a stress test report had recently been carried out, which he had signed. This covered earthquakes, flooding, severe weather and station blackout scenarios. The stress test report and the final report would be forwarded to the ONR within the given deadline of the end of December 2012.

Mr Weir advised that if any small events occurred on site, he would advise members of the committee in an attempt to keep everyone informed in an open and transparent manner. In response, Mrs Holmes requested confirmation that the spillage on the roadway occurred on site and proceeded to enquire if the ONR representative for Hunterston B was available for comment. Mr Mark Tyrer responded that the station had engineered barriers for such spills. The concrete bung for any spillage would be contained within the bung and recovery action would take place thereafter. He added that he was perfectly happy with the way in which the station dealt with the situation.

Mrs Holmes enquired as to the general identification of any spillage i.e. whether it was visible. Mr Weir responded that smell was usually the first indication, which indeed occurred on this particular occasion.

5B. ONR REPORT

Mr Mark Tyrer took the ONR report as read, but wished to highlight a few issues.

Mr Tyrer advised that there had been increased ONR inspection activity covering a wide range of areas relating to nuclear safety, mainly due to the coverage of the statutory outage. On continuing, Mr Tyrer stated that the station continued to perform at a very high standard.

With regards to a water pipe leak, Mr Tyrer advised that sections of pipe work were beyond their original design life and needed care and attention. The pipe in question was an old cast-iron pipe which supplied cooling water to pumps and various items around the station. Mr Tyrer stressed that ONR were kept fully informed during the event and were not required to take action or interfere in any way as the station behaved in the correct manner.

In response, Mrs Holmes enquired as to how the leak was detected. Mr Weir responded that sump-pump water was going into the pump-house from the leak, which resulted in the sump-pump and drainage alarms alerting operators to visit the pump-house. A large puddle of water was noted outside the pump-house and therefore they assumed there was a leak from R3. If for example the leak was somewhere out with the pump house, such as within the reactor building, any increase in temperature in the heat exchanges would alert them to a problem in the cooling water flow, or indeed they would start to see a lack of flow to the heat exchangers.

In conclusion, Mr Tyrer added that there was an extensive project underway to replace the old pipe work and that the leaking pipe in question was the last piece of pipe which required to be replaced. This is due for replacement next summer.

6A. HUNTERSTON A SITE REPORT

Mr Roach took the Sire report as read and highlighted a few key points. Mr Roach advised that it had been 30 months since the last lost-time accident at Hunterston A, a remarkable achievement given the large amount of construction work on site. Mr Roach added that the success of the site was largely due to the open and honest approach of the workforce and their skills and experience.

Mr Roach advised that the ONR fire inspector had recently visited the Site. Whilst there were some minor improvements highlighted to ensure good practice, the Site was awarded a pass.

Mr Roach advised that the pond decommissioning work continued to be the critical path item for Hunterston A, adding that dewatering had commenced and the first discharge was conducted during November 2011.

Mr Roach stated that he was aware that resolving the issue of the CP7 compound was of vital importance to the community and as such, a decision had been made to establish a solution to offer a sustained period of confidence within the area. Mr Roach made reference to the previous SSG meeting whereby two options had been proposed; a complete dig to remove all material or alternatively to install an engineered barrier. Discussions had resulted in excellent feedback, which was subsequently forwarded to the licensee. As a result, Magnox had now decided on the insitu proposal, which was in line with the feedback received from the SSG, the NDA strategy and the expectations of SEPA. Mr Roach stressed the importance of ensuring its success given there had already been two unsuccessful attempts to contain the area. He added that they would ensure a contractor was appointed who had the best possible chance of ensuring its success. Mr Roach envisaged that the contract would be issued in April 2012.

With regards to the Graphite Pathfinder Project, Mr Roach explained that a presentation was given to the NDA on 19 September 2011. He added that whilst initial feedback was positive and all milestones were achieved, there was no desire at this stage to proceed, as no compelling business case could be established. Consequently, this resulted in a review of strategy on bunker one and encapsulation of bunkers two to five.

Mrs Holmes made reference to dewatering of the pond, and enquired as to whether heavy rainfall would have an effect on the amount of discharge or whether it was independent of weather conditions. Mr Reuben Phillips responded that it would normally be independent of weather conditions and advised that there was currently one discharge tank with an additional two expected imminently. With regards to the recent heavy rainfall, the Site had been processing additional water rising from the pond, which resulted in no further discharges. Mr Phillips added however that once the three discharge tanks were insitu, these would be independent of weather conditions.

Mrs Holmes requested clarification as to why these were not independent of each other. Mr Phillips responded that there were two independent systems; storm/surface water going into storm drains and also miscellaneous water such as shower water and process water from the plant.

Mrs Holmes enquired as to whether there would ever be an issue with excess water i.e. heavy rainfall and only one tank. Mr Phillips responded that this should never be an issue as the other two tanks were ready to come online, which would provide sufficient support.

Mrs Holmes asked if the discharge limit and its regularity were checked prior to discharge. Mr Phillips responded that an activity assessment of the water was undertaken before each discharge. Once the water is discharged, a sample is taken which confirmed what has been discharged. Mr Roach added that SEPA have regulations which the Site are required to meet before a final decision was made to discharge.

In addition, Mrs Holmes made reference to the environment liquid discharges and enquired as to whether the limits were expected to increase due to the discharging of the pond water. Mr Phillips responded that these would increase slightly as they would be discharging more water than normal, however this would be nowhere near the limit of authorisation.

Mr John Lamb enquired about the status of the two fuel elements which were recovered from the pond and whether these were on or off site. Mr Roach responded that these were still on site, within the pond, which was considered the safest position. They were locked down in two baskets with protection devices to prevent inadvertent removal and a plan was in place. Equipment had now arrived on site, which had been tested, and it was anticipated that these items would be removed to a wet flask during January 2012 and thereafter transferred to a temporary dry flask until such time as an appropriate fuel transfer flask became available.

Mr Bale made reference to the CP7 compound, which was raised at the National Stakeholder Group meeting. Discussions had included its previous failures, the decision to go for a small dig as opposed to a large dig and if this failed, who would be responsible. Assurances had now been received from colleagues within the NDA that if the contractor failed, the NDA would take responsibility. Mr Bale added that although they had received these verbal assurances, they were hopeful that this agreement would be honoured. In response, Mr Roach stated that the Site was required to suspend the routine sampling on the 15"-18" outfalls due to the inclement weather. This had now been restated and the first sampling results were clear with

nothing to report to SEPA. Consequently, the Site's mitigation was working. Mr Roach advised that the decision to leave the material insitu was taken due to the nature of the hazard being relatively small. A large dig would result in creating another hole elsewhere with a barrier around it, which would result in the same solution as that being offered at Hunterston A. Furthermore, a greater dig may result in increased contamination. In conclusion, Mr Roach stated that he understood the underlying emotion, although the balanced view had taken into account matters of fact, science and engineering.

Cllr Gallagher responded that the original question was who would be financially responsible if the solution was unsuccessful. Consequently, he enquired as to whether an informal discussion and commitment was adequate. In response, Dr Adrian Simper, NDA Strategic Director, stated that the discussion included the liability for the contamination and if the insitu disposal failed, the liability would be considered a commercial matter and therefore remained with the contractor. At the end of the day however, the overall liability would lie with the NDA both in law and morality. The remediation would be carried out in accordance with NDA and they would instruct Magnox to advise the best means to render the risk. Mr Roach stressed the insitu solution referred to previously did not mean disposal, it was simply a temporary barrier system to prevent further leakage.

On continuing, Mr Bale made reference to the change in strategy for Fuel Element Debris (FED) dissolution and requested that the SSG be kept informed. Mr Roach agreed that although this issue was important, they were still to make their case. He added that the Site would keep the SSG updated and if suitable communications occurred in-between meetings, he would ensure that these were distributed.

Mrs Holmes wondered whether different options to FED had been investigated; whether alternative processes had been considered and whether there was a report on the relevant advantages and disadvantages of each, including the cost and savings to the public. Also, why had the nitric acid process been chosen, what standard would SEPA use to consent any discharge to the Clyde and how had they derived at their consent. Finally, had the precautionary principle been applied and how would compliance by SEPA be assured.

In response, Mr Roach stated that it was still at an early stage and therefore no decision or authorisation had been made. The existing strategy at the Site was to retrieve material, encapsulate it in stainless steel boxes, hold it in storage and then send it to the Geological Disposal Facility. Mr Roach noted that Scottish Government's policy discussed new and different ways forward.

Mr Roach advised that circa three years ago, the Site discussed different ways forward in light of the proposed Government changes, and sought approval from ONR to reinstate the approval notice and funding from NDA to undertake a review. A best practicable option study was carried out which highlighted that the best option was the previously tested Magnox approach to FED dissolution. Mr Roach added the next step would be to compile a business case and that to date, no decision had been undertaken. Mr Roach promised to continually engage and advise the SSG accordingly, adding that there would be other compliance and authorisation steps including possible public consultation.

Mrs Holmes enquired if it had been put on hold because no decision had been made on the nitric dissolution in bunker one, and whether the Site could proceed with the encapsulation of bunkers two to five. Mr Roach responded that the current strategy would be to commence with

bunker five as it was less hazardous and would enable them to practice and develop their skills before tackling something more onerous.

In addition, Mrs Holmes enquired about intermediate level waste storage and if EnergySolutions intended marketing the existing storage capacity to customers outside the Hunterston A and B sites. Mr Roach stated that this issue was included within the following NDA report however clarified that EnergySolutions were not the owners of the facility and were therefore not trying to “sell its worth”.

Finally, Mr Roach wished to advise that after six and a half years as Site Director, he would be leaving to undertake a position elsewhere and therefore wished to offer his thanks to the members of the SSG. In return, Mr Bale thanked Mr Roach for his efforts over the years and wished him every success in his new role. Mrs Holmes also took the opportunity to offer thanks to Mr Roach for his assistance over the years.

6B NDA REPORT

Mr Rushton commenced by advising that the successful bidder for Dounreay had been announced in November 2011, which was Babcock Dounreay Partnership. He advised that a transitional phase would now commence with regards to the transfer of shares and the new parent body organisation taking occupancy of Dounreay in April 2012. Babcock Dounreay Partnership was made up of Babcock Nuclear Services, CH2M Hill and URS Holdings Ltd.

In addition, Mr Rushton announced the resignation of Mr Tony Fountain (NDA Chief Executive) who had brought significant change to the company since joining in 2009. Recruitment for his successor was underway.

On continuing, Mr Rushton advised that consultation of the draft business plan would commence on Monday 12 December 2011, copies of which would be available for download from their website. Hard copies could be obtained via the Secretariat if required.

With regards to Hunterston A, Mr Rushton congratulated the Site on their excellent safety record which continued despite hazards such as working at height and the recent weather conditions, all of which were testament to the efforts of the team. With regards to the recent adverse weather conditions, the Site responded well to the strong winds and rain, providing frequent updates to the NDA and its regulators.

Mr Rushton stated that he was pleased that the pond dewatering had commenced with the forthcoming commissioning of the wet ILW plant and commencement of the retrieval of waste in the New Year.

Mr Rushton made reference to recent discussions at previous SSG meetings on the Graphite Pathfinder Project and the subsequent meeting with the NDA in September 2011. A decision had been taken not to progress the project further for various reasons, including the fact that an ILW store was already on site, ready to receive material.

Following the meeting in September, Mr Rushton added that various questions were asked of Magnox Ltd. The first related to FED dissolution in whereby Magnox were asked to work on a business case. The second request was for a study to detail what could be done with ILW storage in central and southern Scotland (in relation to NDA strategy of exploring opportunities to share current and planned storage assets thus improving value for money, reduce the

environmental impact on new store build and the impact on decommissioning timescales). In addition, the strategy management system was also detailed of which there were five stages:

- Research
- Defining credible options
- Assessing options and selecting the preferred one
- Approving the strategy
- Implementation

Mr Rushton advised that the NDA had engaged Magnox Ltd to develop a credible options paper for “ILW Storage Solutions for Central and Southern Scotland”. He stressed that this was a credible options paper and therefore there were no preferential foregone conclusions.

Mr Rushton stated that although there was spare storage capacity, the NDA wished to identify whether it was sufficient for the capacity and the Hunterston material. Consequently, consideration would also be given as to whether there should be one ILW store per site or whether there were any benefits in having regional stores.

Finally, Mr Rushton stated that it was his intention to engage with the SSG through the entire process, but he wished to stress that he would only engage when he felt it appropriate. Ultimately, the output of the review would relate into the Scottish Government’s review of higher activity waste.

Mrs Holmes responded that she hoped the NDA understood concerns regarding the nitric dissolution plant as it discharged into the River Clyde. She added that alternative options to the discharge would be looked upon favourably as it would reduce the amount of discharge into the Clyde. In response, Dr Simper advised that Magnox Ltd had been instructed to provide the NDA with the best practical environmental option for the material. Magnox Ltd had successfully used FED dissolution at other sites and had demonstrated that in those cases, this was the best practical environmental option. Magnox Ltd was therefore reviewing suitable options and would advise their findings in due course.

Mrs Holmes made reference to the material following the dissolution, stating that a small volume would go into the ILW store with the remaining discharges going into the Clyde. Dr Simper responded that they would be concentrating their activity on the smaller volume of waste, as the Government’s policy on land waste management was to “concentrate and contain”. “Concentration” was therefore considered a key element for the management of radioactive waste.

Mr Bale responded with regards to storage/importing of waste, reiterating that both he and Vice Chair had previously stressed that at this moment in time, the SSG considered it unacceptable to import waste from other Sites other than from Hunterston B.

On continuing, Dr Simper made reference to the Scottish Government’s policy on higher activity waste, which referred to near site, near surface disposal. This policy made it clear that near site did not mean on site. There is currently no strategy for compliance of the policy therefore NDA and EDF were unable to instigate any planning as they are unsure how this is related in terms of location and disposal of storage of individual waste. They are therefore trying to work out a strategy to plan what waste goes where, because until this is established no meaningful discussions with local communities and regulators could take place.

Cllr Gallagher stated that if it were a possibility that the Hunterston ILW store would be used as a dump for nuclear waste from any other area, this would be strongly resisted. Dr Simper explained that the original volumes of waste calculations which led to the design of the store were historic, and Magnox had optimised the packaging on waste products. In addition, Dr Simper added that the store was built as an interim store pending geological disposal of the waste. This was not going to occur as it would be contrary to Scottish Government policy.

Cllr Gallagher felt that the policy fitted perfectly with the pre-built facility, however when it was originally built, locals were advised it was for a completely different use altogether. He enquired as to why the Scottish Government would have such a policy without having any technical idea as to how it would be implemented. Dr Simper reiterated that the store was built for historical reasons. He did accept however that the proposals may appear unattractive to the community, and advised that this would be taken into consideration.

Mr Roach stated that he appreciated that it may appear from the outside that there were ulterior motives, however stated that he personally knew this to be untrue. He advised that the original policy came from a question within Scottish Parliament and it would be another three to four years before the policy became a strategy. Mr Roach proposed that regular updates would help dispel the disquiet.

Mr Bale referred to the previous Scottish Sites meeting, attended by himself and the Vice Chair, when the topic of high-level strategy was raised. He explained that Mr Ewan Young of the Scottish Government gave a commitment that there would be consultations with local stakeholders regarding the Government's intentions. Mr Bale reiterated the importance of early engagement on any issue, which may help to dispel any conspiracy theories.

Cllr Gallagher advised that the controversy surrounding the carbon capture and clean coal plant proposal in the area had dispelled a lot of the suspicion. The amount of goodwill/public acceptance could be lost if they continue with the proposal to transport waste into the area. Mr Bale agreed with this statement and thanked Dr Simper for his contribution to the discussion.

A member of the public made reference to Cllr Gallagher's comments and reiterated that if the aforementioned considerations were to be leaked to the public, there would be an outcry. In response, Dr Simper advised that the minutes were published and publically accessible.

7. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

Mr Bale sought clarification that Mr Mark Stubbs would be Mr Roach's replacement. Mr Roach confirmed this and advised that Mr Stubbs would undertake his new appointment from 1 January 2012.

8. DATE & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Mr Bale advised that the 2012 SSG meeting dates had been agreed as:

Thursday 8 March – The Seamill Hydro Hotel, 1.30pm
Thursday 7 June – The Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan, 1.30pm
Thursday 6 September – The Brisbane House Hotel, Largs, 1.30pm
Thursday 6 December – The Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan, 1.30pm

Mr Tony Bale
SSG Chair

ACTION LIST

26th Site Stakeholder Group Meeting

Thursday 8 December 2011

No	Action	Responsible	Target Date	Status/Comments
01	To amend errors in the previous minutes as highlighted under Approval of Previous Minutes (page 2).	D Rooney	08/03/12	Complete
02	To create an Action List at the end of the minutes for ease of reference at future meetings.	D Rooney	08/03/12	Complete
03	To update Council Directors and possibly the Ayrshire Emergency Planning Group regarding discussions on emergency planning and report the outcome at the next meeting.	H McGhee	08/03/12	Carried forward from SSG meeting on 8 September 2011
04	To request a quarterly update from each of the five nominated projects for NDA funding to monitor how each project is progressing.	T Bale	08/03/12	Complete