

Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group

**THE TWENTY-SEVENTH HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY 8 MARCH 2012, SEAMILL HYDRO HOTEL, SEAMILL**

Present:

Magnox Ltd

Mr Tony Bale (Chair)
Mr Mark Stubbs
Mr Reuben Phillips

Community Councillors

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

Community Council Representatives

Mr Douglas MacFarlane (Largs)
Mr Ian Frame (Cumbrae)
Mr Kenny MacDougall (Ardrossan)

Councillors

Cllr Robert Barr
Cllr Elisabeth Marshall
Cllr Elizabeth McLardy
Cllr Alex Gallagher

Community Members

Mr John Robertson

In Attendance

Mr Derek Rooney, Magnox Ltd
Mrs Shelagh Milligan, Magnox Ltd
Miss Vicky Simm, Magnox Ltd
Mr Sean Marshall, Magnox Ltd
Dr Adam Meehan, Magnox Ltd

EDF Energy

Mr Colin Weir
Mr Stuart McGhie (Trade Union Representative)

NDA

Mr Jonathan Jenkin

ONR

Mr Chris Kemp

SEPA

Mr Keith Hammond

North Ayrshire Council

Mr Hugh McGhee

Hunterston Estate

Mr Angus Cochran-Patrick
Mr Ralston Ryder

National Farmers Union

Mr William Jack

Mr Allan McRae, CNC, EDF Energy
Ms Claire Cook, EDF Energy
Dr James McKinney, NDA
Mr Mike Calloway, NDA

Several members of the public were also in attendance

Apologies:

Mr Bill Hamilton, Mr Anthony Garnett, Mr Ewan Young and Cllr John Reid.

1. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Chairman, Mr Tony Bale welcomed everyone to the 27th meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group (SSG).

2. CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR UPDATES/CORRESPONDENCE

Mr Bale introduced Mr Mark Stubbs (previously Deputy Site Director and Project Manager) as the newly appointed Site Director of Hunterston A. Mr Stubbs commenced his new position in January 2012 following the departure of Mr Peter Roach. Consequently, this would be his first attendance at the SSG meeting in his new capacity as Site Director.

Correspondence had been received from the NDA announcing Mr John Clarke as their new CEO following Mr Tony Fountain's departure in December. On behalf of the SSG, Mr Bale took the opportunity to wish Mr Clarke well in his new post which was due to commence on 2 April 2012.

The NDA's Radioactive Waste Management Directorate had invited the SSG to attend a workshop on 28 March 2012 in Cockermouth, Cumbria to look at future monitoring techniques, with interest expressed from SSG members to attend. Mr Bale advised that he would provide an update on the event at the SSG meeting in June 2012. **(Action 01)**

Mr Bale advised that he had attended an intermediate level waste workshop on 26 January 2012 in Edinburgh, facilitated by the NDA, which focused on storage options for Higher Activity Waste (HAW). Mr Bale stated that the message he conveyed at the workshop was that the Hunterston A store was for Hunterston A waste only, however consideration may be given to store Hunterston B waste if a feasible safety case could be submitted.

Mr Bale had received correspondence from Ms Claire Dodd at The Scottish Government which invited one of the SSG nominated representatives from Hunterston, Chapelcross and Dounreay to represent the three Scottish sites at a Technical Advisory Group workshop. Mr Bale stated that he would respond to Ms Dodd and advise the outcome at the next SSG meeting. **(Action 02)**

A member of the public audience drew attention to MOD literature on the submarine dismantling project and noted concerns with regards to the MOD's intentions for the nuclear submarines. He referred to the fact that it had been stressed that Hunterston would only store locally produced radioactive material and that the literature had referred to ILW containers being small enough to store submarine nuclear material when broken down. The member of the public wished to stress that the submarine nuclear material should not be transferred to Hunterston. Mr Bale noted the comments, which were duly recorded.

3. MATTERS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

Action 1 - Mr Bale noted that Mr Derek Rooney had carried out some wording amendments from the December minutes.

Action 2 – An active list of actions had been introduced which would be included in all future minutes.

Action 3 – A request for a quarterly update on the five projects selected for “quick-win” NDA funding had been completed.

One outstanding action was noted for Mr Hugh McGhee to assist with discussions on

emergency planning. Having spoken to the relevant parties, Mr McGhee was now in a position to provide feedback to the SSG on this matter. He conveyed that community councils were not involved within the emergency phase of the plan, as this phase was run by the police and other emergency services, health and regulatory authorities with all communication via a media briefing centre to avoid confusion. Mr McGhee added that after the emergency phase, it was then handed over to the council who would decipher what was happening in the community with Community Council being engaged at this point.

Mr Kenny MacDougall drew attention to information received from Ayrshire Civils Contingency Team who had highlighted points on this matter. Mr MacDougall believed this issue to be Scottish Government Policy and added that if an incident occurred in the area, Community Councillors should be included within the group to assist with different aspects. Mr MacDougall expressed his concern that the point had been argued for many years for the SSG to be more involved in emergency prepare groups. Mr MacDougall stressed the importance of working together and involving the community if something were to happen in the area. Mr Bale commented that he had not received any correspondence in relation to this matter and agreed with Mr MacDougall that there should be a discussion group between the local community and council. Mr Bale did not deem this matter to be a specific SSG issue and suggested that Mr McGhee take time to reflect and, if appropriate, he should take it to another level by involving local groups.

Mr McGhee reported that the off-site emergency plan referred to a list of participating agencies and Community Councils were not mentioned within the acute phase of an emergency. Mr McGhee clarified that there would however be a role for the Community Councils at the recovery stage when local knowledge would become invaluable. Mr Bale stated that clarification was required in order that the SSG understood where local groups would fit within the plan in the event of an emergency.

A member of the public audience noted previous reluctance from North Ayrshire Council to discuss emergency procedures. He directed the SSG to a document on emergency procedure which was listed on the North Ayrshire Council website with a sizeable document available on Hunterston's emergency procedure. In conclusion, Mr Bale commented that Mr Hugh McGhee had outlined steps which would be taken in any emergency and it would appear that the Community Council would be involved in the second phase. Mr Bale appreciated that the policy was set, however reiterated that it required clarification. Mrs Holmes advised that they were also in receipt of this correspondence and that Fairlie had invited the Ayrshire Contingencies Team to attend their next meeting to discuss emergency procedures.

4. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

Mr Andy Taylor noted a few minor typing anomalies within the previous minutes to be rectified as follows: Page four - "Ammonium" should be "Ammonia"; "purpose bung" should read "purpose bund". Mrs Rita Holmes noted a grammatical change on page seven, line four which read: "Consequently, this resulted in a review of the strategy bunker one or encapsulation of bunkers two to five". The word "or" should be replaced with "and".

Pending the above changes, the minutes were approved by Councillor Robert Barr and seconded by Councillor Elizabeth McLardy. **(Action 03)**

5.A HUNTERSTON B STATION REPORT

Mr Colin Weir took the Hunterston B report as read. Mr Weir noted that weather had affected the Site over the quarter and on 8 December 2011, reactor four had been lost due to grid disturbances. He added that as of 16 March 2012, the Site would be four years without any lost time injury. Mr Weir stated that the Site continually monitored zero harm and strived to improve on this going forward. He added that over 800 staff had received training regarding their own responsibility towards safety.

Mr Weir spoke of several major plant projects on site including construction of a new nitrogen plant, with the focus remaining on safety at all times. Mr Weir noted that there had been no events involving radiological protection during the period. He was extremely proud of the fact that, at the recent Nuclear Generation Challenge meeting, Hunterston B won four out of seven awards for Radiological Protection, Reliable Operation, Outage Performance and Best Overall Performance.

With reference to Generation R3TG7, Mr Weir reported that the unit had operated continuously at optimum power. On 3 January 2012, loads were reduced on both units due to severe winds and some of the gridlines into the station were lost. Mr Weir documented that in November 2011, reactor four operated at optimum performance. An automatic trip occurred on 8 December 2011 due to adverse weather conditions and some of Scottish Power's protection systems failing to operate.

Mr Weir advised that he had issued a letter following the previous SSG meeting in respect of a small fire which occurred on site. He stressed the importance of updating the local community via the SSG and would continue to do so in respect of any events.

In relation to the award received for "Best Operator", Mr Weir advised that a cheque had been received for £1,000, which was subsequently donated to the local charity, North Ayrshire Cancer Care.

Mrs Holmes requested further details on the fire that had taken place at Hunterston B and to confirm whether external emergency services were in attendance. Mr Weir explained that the fire had occurred on an electrical air conditioning panel within the main stores. A miniature circuit breaker had failed to activate causing electrical overheating within the panel. Mr Weir reported that as part of their emergency procedures, external emergency services had been dispatched in addition to the station's own. Fire brigade teams from Largs and Ardrossan attended, however the station's fire team had extinguished the fire upon their arrival.

Mrs Holmes also raised concern regarding the chemical Hydrazine and was horrified to learn of the consequences of it escaping into the environment. Mrs Holmes asked what measures were taken to deal with Hydrazine. Mr Andy Taylor explained that Hydrazine was an oxygen scavenging chemical used commonly across the power plants. He added that it was his understanding that Hydrazine was included within an inspection under major accidents and hazards and it had been identified that it was a material which needed to be carefully handled and stored. He stated that assessments had been carried out and a few improvements made in terms of its storage and handling, which involved fully bunding the tank and placing it in separate housing. Mr Taylor concluded that in terms of any major spillages, arrangements were in place which had been approved by an Inspector. Mrs Holmes requested to see a written report if available. Mr Taylor would address this. **(Action 04)**

Mr MacDougall raised concerns with regards to the failure to consider the effects on safety and a leakage into the River Clyde, stating that this contradicted the station's good record. In response, Mr Weir advised that different lines of defense were insitu at Hunterston B should a situation arise to ensure a credible fault of 1 in 10,000 years. Mr Weir reiterated that Mr Taylor had given an explanation of the defenses in place and that the Health and Safety Executive had carried out an inspection.

Mr Allan Rice enquired about the continuous blow down from boilers and chemicals in a bunded area. Mr Weir replied that the boiler did not "blow down" in that fashion continuously and it was in fact, in a closed loop with all chemicals bunded.

In response to a point raised by a member of the public audience regarding the wind turbines adjacent to Hunterston B, Mr Weir advised that the station had received a report from SSE in relation to blade throw which met the safety case requirements of the plant.

Mrs Holmes noted the need to replace potassium iodate tablets in the locality, as they were out of date. She asked if there was possibility of the detailed emergency planning zone being extended. Mr Weir advised that post Fukushima, all aspects of emergency and plans would be discussed and in consultation with the local authority and the zone may change in the future.

Mr Hugh McGhee expressed that it was his understanding that the detailed emergency planning zone had a radius of 2.4km, as identified by the Health & Safety Executive and ONR. He suggested that the "off-site emergency plan" referred to an "outline emergency planning zone" that stretched to 10km, which took in Largs, Millport, West Kilbride and part of Ardrossan. Mrs Holmes enquired whether it would be possible for the Emergency Planning Officer from North Ayrshire Council to give a presentation at the next meeting.

Mr Allan Rice indicated that he had made a request to visit Hunterston B but had received no suitable date as yet. Mr Stuart McGhie highlighted that two dates were unfortunately required to be cancelled, however suggested that Mr Rice contact him directly and he would make the necessary security arrangements.

In conclusion, Mr Bale congratulated Mr Weir on Hunterston B's lost time safety record, which was well ahead of the nuclear fleet. **(Action 05)**

5.B SEPA REPORT

Mr Keith Hammond took the report as read and notified the SSG of the recent appointment of Mr James Curran as Chief Executive of SEPA who commenced his new position in January 2012. Mr Hammond enquired openly if there were any issues relating to SEPA.

With regards to the outage, Mrs Holmes enquired as to whether the volume of aerial discharge would increase and whether or not this amount varied. Mr Hammond advised that it could vary and was dependent on various factors. Mrs Holmes commented that the SSG at Sizewell seemed to be very active and records of their daily emissions of aerial discharge had been requested. Mrs Holmes asked if it were possible to produce a daily record of emissions. Mr Hammond responded that filters, which were recorded every few days, measured some of the radio nuclides and that when there was a blow down, a separate recording method was used to illustrate this. Mr Hammond added that at present, reports were supplied on a monthly basis. Mr Bale enquired as to whether there was anything significant or above level within

these reports to which Mr Hammond replied that they were a fraction (around 50%) lower than the limit. At this point Mr Andy Taylor offered a technical explanation in this regard.

Mr MacDougall made reference to the aforementioned discussion regarding Hydrazine and the possibility of it entering the River Clyde. He enquired if SEPA were of the same assumption that this would be considered a 1 in 10,000 event. Mr Hammond replied by stating that control of major accidents and hazards was a legislative method. It was a joint undertaking with partners and Health & Safety Executives to carry out inspections to ensure that Hydrazine was cared for and handled correctly. Mr Hammond did advise that there was potential (however unlikely) and that SEPA would obtain appropriate assessments and review.

Mr Douglas MacFarlane highlighted that within the first paragraph of the regulation, it stated that a minor variation application was expected. Mr MacFarlane asked if this meant that the pressure vessel would be required to be taken up to its maximum safe limit to cause the valves to lift. Mr Hammond explained that this was a test required by ONR to demonstrate that the valves would lift in event of an emergency. The pressure relief valves are not currently listed as an authorised route, so to demonstrate that they work would be contravention of authorisation. It was therefore felt that these valves should be added to the list of authorised routes as a minor variation. Mr Andy Taylor added that the reactor pressure vessel was not being taken to a pressure that would make the relief valve lift.

5.C ONR REPORT

Mr Chris Kemp, ONR offered apologies on behalf of Dr Mark Tyrer and enquired if there were any questions arising from the report.

Mrs Holmes enquired as to how many people were involved in the transport team at ONR. Mr Kemp estimated around 12 people covering radioactive transport in the company, however requested that he confirm exact numbers via the Secretariat. **(Action 06)**

***Mr Kemp has since confirmed this figure to be 16.**

Mrs Holmes expressed her concern that the SSG had not been responding to various consultations and as an SSG member, she felt it important to be active. Mr Bale agreed that, if relevant, the SSG should respond to consultations that arose. Mr John Lamb indicated that West Kilbride Community Council had responded to a recent consultation relating to submarines and bulk quantities and stressed that it was up to individual members to respond as well as the SSG as a group. Mr Bale agreed with this statement.

Mr MacFarlane asked for an explanation on the monitoring of project progress with regards to the installation of super articulated rods and seismic system. In response, Mr Weir explained that it was enhancements which were being carried out to the safety case in terms of a seismic event.

6.A HUNTERSTON A SITE REPORT

Mr Mark Stubbs took the report as read and recorded that in January 2012, a Magnox operator sustained a soft tissue injury which resulted in a lost time accident. Mr Stubbs noted that previous to this incident, Hunterston A had gone 32 months without a lost time accident. Mr Stubbs wished to note that the Site had been awarded a Silver Healthy Working Lives Award.

Mr Stubbs also noted that there had been success in early retrieval of two high dose rate items which were retrieved and safely contained within a shielded flask. He added that this work was carried out in an exemplary manner by everyone involved.

Mr Stubbs explained that work to implement the in-situ remediation of the Site's CP7 compound and associated drainage would commence in May 2012. He added that this work would include the construction of a temporary access road for the duration of the remediation works.

Mr MacDougall enquired as to which company had won the contract for the CP7 compound. Mr Stubbs responded that the contract had not yet been awarded. Physical works were scheduled to commence around May with the majority of the work being completed by the end of 2012.

Mr John Robertson requested an explanation on the process involved with the identification of high dose rate items from the pond. Mr Stubbs explained that, having found these two items in the pond during decommissioning, extensive further surveys had been carried out and the Site were very confident that there were no others.

Mr Robertson highlighted his concerns in relation to charitable donations, stating that he objected to the £2,000 recently allocated to the Largs Town Twinning Association. Mr Robertson added that this was not a charitable organization in his opinion and the funding should have been donated towards the good of the surrounding areas. In response, Mr Stubbs stated that the Site welcomed funding requests from the local community however gave assurances that this particular application did meet the funding criteria.

Cllr Alex Gallagher enquired as to what level of employment had been sought and how many individuals could be employed locally. Mr Stubbs responded that requirements indicated around 12 people and confirmed that at present, these were from the maintenance and operations sector, sourced via local advertisements and job centres.

A member of the public audience commented that Hunterston B did not object to the neighbouring wind turbines and enquired if Hunterston A were also satisfied that blade throw and noise were at a level acceptable to workers. Mr Stubbs advised that Hunterston A had received similar reassurance and was satisfied with the response.

Mr Lamb referred to the reactor weather envelope at Hunterston A and highlighted that in 2006, permission was granted for its replacement. As the temporary weather barrier had been in place for some time, Mr Lamb requested an update as to when the final barrier would be implemented and asked why the SSG had not been kept up to date on this matter. Mr Stubbs confirmed that the temporary weather barrier was completed early 2010 and that the Site planned to replace the temporary weather barrier with a more permanent weather solution in the future. Mr Stubbs proposed that he would seek clarification in order to address Mr Lamb's comments. **(Action 07)**

Mr Rice asked if a fire had occurred on 10 February 2012 as there was no reference to this within the report. Mr Stubbs confirmed that controlled work had been carried out on a metal pressure vessel which was believed to be safe and cool, however a piece of pipework was placed onto the pressure vessel with plastic on the end, which subsequently discoloured and gave off smoke. This was observed quickly and responded to by the site-based emergency response team. The fire service were also dispatched, however upon arrival, the cause of the smoke had already been identified and dealt with.

In relation to the fire, Mrs Holmes enquired as to whether the metal pressure vessel was a radioactive piece of material. Mr Stubbs confirmed that it had been an old fuelling machine which had been used during the operational phase and was contaminated on the inside walls. As the fire had occurred on a Friday afternoon when the site had closed, Mrs Holmes expressed concern with the lack of individuals within the vicinity during this time, which could have affected detection of the fire. Mr Stubbs explained that the fire had taken place around midday so there were many people to assist. Mr Stubbs also stressed that a 24 hour emergency response is available on site.

6.B ONR REPORT

Mr Kemp reported that he had made two visits to Hunterston A during the period and an annual safety review had been carried out. Various decommissioning projects had been looked at and meetings held with SEPA and the licensee on various waste projects, with the focus being on control and supervision and the requirement to have a system in place. Mr Kemp indicated that part of his job was to check compliance with those systems.

Mrs Holmes asked for Mr Kemp's thoughts on the fire incident at Hunterston A. Mr Kemp confirmed that the incident was merely a piece of smoking plastic which, in the grand scheme of things, was not significant.

6.C SEPA REPORT

Mr Derek Rooney confirmed that no report had been received from SEPA. On behalf of the SSG, Mr Bale requested that Mr Hammond express disappointment to SEPA that a report had not been received.

6.D NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY UPDATE

Mr Jonathan Jenkin, who was deputizing for Mr David Rushton, informed the group that Mr John Clarke had been announced as the new NDA executive. Mr Clarke joined the board in 2008 with more than 30 years experience across the industry.

With regards to the competition to appoint a new parent body for Magnox, Mr Jenkin indicated NDA would be publishing a prior information notice in the Official Journal of the European Union during April. Mr Jenkin promised to provide an update to the group throughout this process.

In addition, Mr Jenkin advised the SSG of an information document which provided an overview of the Higher Activity Waste on sites, methods of treatment packages, storage and ultimately disposal. Mr Jenkin indicated that this report was available on the NDA website or a hard copy could be supplied on request via the secretariat.

Mr Jenkin announced a recent successful funding application, however as the announcement was yet to be formally released, he respectfully requested that further details be omitted from the minutes. In addition, Mr Jenkin confirmed that the NDA had also received four additional funding applications which would be given consideration in the new financial year. Mr Jenkin highlighted that the NDA would provide regular updates on the approval process of the applications. He gave a recommendation that as socio-economic matters gathered momentum, a regular update from an officer from the council would be necessary. Mr Bale advised that Cllr Alex Gallagher had volunteered to liaise with the council accordingly.

(Action 08)

9. UPDATE ON CENTRAL & SOUTHERN ILW STORAGE STRATEGIC STUDY

Dr James McKinney, Head of Integrated Waste Management for the NDA, presented an update on the Central & Southern ILW Storage Strategic Study. Dr McKinney intimated that the credible options being developed for this study did not consider the higher activity waste (HAW) arising from reactor final site clearance, Dounreay or Ministry of Defence.

Dr McKinney highlighted that the term HAW was a term which encompassed a broad category of waste including high level, intermediate level and a small proportion of low level waste, not suitable for disposal at the low level repository near Drigg or the facility at Dounreay. As there is no high level waste within Scotland, this study only considers intermediate level waste.

Dr McKinney drew attention to the recently published Scottish Government HAW Policy for the long-term management of higher radioactivity waste in near surface facilities. He noted the intention that facilities should be located as near to the site where the waste was produced as possible. The approach to this strategy could be at national, regional or local basis. Dr McKinney assured the group that the NDA would continue to support strategic initiatives and engage continually with SSG's, government, regulators and planning authorities.

Dr McKinney explained that another option for consideration would be the Hunterston A ILW Store receiving waste from Hunterston B. Dr McKinney stressed that while this was indeed a possibility, no decision had yet been made.

On concluding his presentation, Dr McKinney suggested that if the study was compared to the overall ILW inventory in Scotland, it would show a very small percentage of approximately 1%.

A member of the public audience enquired as to what the aforementioned 1% represented in terms of volume. Dr Adam Meehan confirmed that this amounted to approximately 90 packages. Mr Meehan explained that there were around 70-80 packages at Hunterston B and around a dozen at Torness. This compares to around 1,600 at Hunterston A.

An audience member asked what size of building would be required to house such material and the overall costs involved. Dr Meehan confirmed that a small storage facility would be appropriate for wet waste storage. He added that the life cycle cost of the Hunterston ILW Store was approximately £40m. Mr Mike Calloway added that as part of an ongoing work stream, costs relating to on-site storage would be assessed as well as the opportunities for reduction associated with consolidated storage. Dr McKinney emphasised that as part of the overarching strategy, it was the NDA's intention to consider re-using recycled material whilst driving down the number of waste packages produced.

Mr Stuart McGhie noted concerns regarding safety, security and financial cost when referring to high level storage and one purpose built retrievable site. Mr McGhie questioned the acceptance from local communities should Hunterston become a storage area for Scotland's ILW.

Cllr Alex Gallagher raised the question that if the Scottish Government's near site, near surface disposal policy did not exist, would the NDA be carrying out this study at all. With emphasis being put on business benefit and value framework, Cllr Gallagher added that the proposal looked like a business case with a drive to use resources rather than a case of what local communities may or may not want. Taking into consideration the proposal not to build a

storage facility at Torness, partnered with the fact that Chapelcross isn't deemed a credible option, Cllr Gallagher suggested that a decision had already been made by the NDA. Dr McKinney confirmed that a decision had not been made and that this was an ongoing process. Dr McKinney explained that the business case considers the value framework process, which includes socio-economic and environmental impact along with lifetime costs. He stressed that today's aim was simply for the NDA to understand the concerns of the local community as part of the ongoing process. He added that further discussion would take place with EDF Energy with Torness being one of the credible options.

Mrs Holmes noted that she was aware of various terms used such as "best practical environmental option", "best available technique", "as low as reasonably achievable" etc and wished clarification on these. Mr Keith Hammond clarified that "best available technique" is a term used in PPC regime and has been adopted down south. In Scotland, the term "best practicable means" tends to be used. Mr Hammond explained that at times, the same concept is used but described differently and agreed it was a confusing plethora of terms. Mr Hammond's preference was to use the term "optimise" which includes all aspects.

Mr Lamb advised that, having previously attending the Scottish Sites meeting where it was announced by Mrs Elisabeth Gray that Scottish sites would keep their waste near surface, near site. this situation had been ongoing for approximately four years without conclusion. He added that the only concrete conclusion thus far was that Hunterston A's ILW Store was given planning permission to store Hunterston A waste only. It was Mr Lamb's belief that in the event of it being used for any other site's waste, the planning process would need to recommence which would cause further delay. Dr McKinney informed Mr Lamb that he understood the current planning position.

Cllr Alex Gallagher informed the SSG of a local development plan, within which was an understanding being for Hunterston B waste to be stored on site. He added that whether this became policy or not may depend on the result of the upcoming election. Mr MacDougall commented that he was unaware of this.

A member of the public audience raised the question as to why Dounreay was excluded from the report and also asked for an explanation to be given as to what was in the packages. Dr McKinney stated that Dounreay was not included due to its inventory being far greater than Hunterston. It was deemed non-credible to move a large inventory to an area with smaller inventory. Dr McKinney further explained that the packages used could be boxes or drums of varying shape and size used to house material, which due to radioactive content, was classified as intermediate level waste. This material is treated, with usual practice being to encapsulate it in grout, and the packages are made from corrosion resistant stainless steel to meet criteria.

Mr MacDougall asked what benefit housing waste at Hunterston A would bring to the local community. Dr McKinney responded to this point by saying that it was a purely strategic study at this stage with the credible options being presented. Mr MacDougall noted that the only thing that differed from previous correspondence was that it had been shown within Dr McKinney's presentation that no MOD waste would be stored at Hunterston. He wished Dr McKinney to be aware that the local communities did not support nuclear waste coming into the area as there would be no benefit to its storage.

10. SOCIO-ECONOMIC FUNDING PROCESS

Mr Sean Marshall addressed the SSG with a presentation on the new Magnox socio-economic funding process which goes live on 1 April 2012. Mr Marshall explained that all of the socio-economic activity required the support of the NDA socio-economic policy with the aim being to mitigate the impact of decommissioning.

Mr Marshall informed the SSG that Magnox North & Magnox South were collaborating to introduce the “Magnox Optimised Decommissioning Programme” (MODP) with the main purpose of reviewing the management of socio-economic funding.

Mr Marshall stated that the NDA had requested Magnox to manage a greater proportion of the socio-economic budget and put in place a system to manage requests of up to and over £100k. The scheme would combine all socio-economic sponsorship and donations into one Magnox scheme. He informed the SSG that Magnox currently managed an annual portfolio of £500k across the 10 Magnox sites through a combination of EnergySolutions and NDA funding.

Mr Marshall explained that the new Magnox scheme would be managed online via a new web portal accessed via the Magnox website. Applications from £1 to £100k should be submitted through this system, which would automatically ask for varying information depending on the level of funding required. Sites would no longer be the primary receiver of the applications, as the socio-economic team would manage them on their behalf. Mr Marshall advised that Magnox would stick rigidly to the pre-defined criteria within the scheme, and that Magnox would have the authority to approve individual projects with a value of £100k. Any projects above this amount would be subject to NDA approval.

Mr Marshall illustrated that the current prioritisation list of the sites were as follows:

High: Bradwell, Trawsfynydd, Dungeness A;
Medium: Hunterston A, Chapelcross, Wylfa;
Low: Berkeley, Hinkley Point A, Oldbury, Sizewell A.

He explained that the reason Hunterston was classed as a medium site was due to the high area of deprivation around the Ardrossan, Saltcoats and Stevenson areas. Hunterston was classed as a relatively large, significant and high quality employer in a remote location.

Mr Marshall added that he would present funding applications to the Magnox socio-economic panel every four to six weeks. Site panel meetings would involve site representatives, the Communications Regional Socio-Economic Officer, Site Director, and the SSG Chair or Vice Chair who would all form part of the final decision making process. Mr Marshall stated that any applications in excess of £10,000 would go to a Magnox executive review panel for comment and final approval before a commitment was made and governance model applied.

Mr Marshall explained to the SSG that he would be stationed at Hunterston for a few days per month to meet with local groups and gave his assurance to communicate regularly with the SSG in this regard. In conclusion, a copy of Mr Marshall's presentation was available on request to SSG members via the secretariat.

Cllr Alex Gallagher raised the question whether the figures quoted by Mr Marshall included

match funding. In response, Mr Marshall clarified that they would not look for evidence of match funding in smaller schemes but would definitely seek evidence of it in larger aspects.

Mrs Holmes felt that the NDA and SSG had a reasonable opportunity to reviewing current projects, however with the change in process, this opportunity would lessen given only one person would represent the SSG on the panel. Mr Marshall informed Mrs Holmes that there would be officers in place to look at the criteria and that quarterly reports would go back to the SSG's. The SSG would also be able to comment on the larger schemes and challenge every application. He believed the deciding panels would prove effective but added that as this was a new scheme, it was flexible and if there was a requirement to extend this, it could be adjusted accordingly. Mr Stubbs gave personal assurance that he would try to ensure the scheme was operated in a fair and transparent manner.

Mr Lamb sought clarification regarding applications up to £100k and whether Magnox would deal them with, yet applications above this amount would be dealt with by NDA. In response, Mr Jenkin confirmed that historically there were three main sources of funding: NDA central socio-economic budget; NDA funding through site license projects and funding provided by parent bodies such as EnergySolutions. He explained that whilst there were still three sources of funding, the aim would be to allocate more funding to the Magnox sites. Mr Jenkin clarified that Magnox could authorize amounts up to £100k, and over £100k, NDA would approve which was consistent and how they planned to operate.

Mr Willie Jack enquired as to the amount of funding available in 2012. Mr Marshall confirmed that no set amounts were listed and it was dependent on the quality of the schemes coming through as to how much was awarded. There was an amount under the control of Magnox, which was circa £1m but no limit, and good schemes presented over £100k would be supported by the NDA. Mr Jenkin added that they were committed across all of the NDA states and as of 1 April 2012, a new budget would be allocated with consideration given to all applications on their merits.

Mr Bale enquired as to whether any outstanding applications would be transferred onto the new forms and put through the new systems. Mr Marshall confirmed that this would indeed be the case and provided examples. In conclusion, Mr Marshall advised that any new application received would be put on hold until 1 April 2012.

11. ANY OTHER COMPETENT BUSINESS

A member of the public audience advised that it was approaching the first anniversary of the disaster at Fukushima and respectfully requested the SSG send a message of support to the Mayor and Fukushima community. Mr Tony Bale responded that the SSG would give the request due consideration. **(Action 09)**

Cllr Robert Barr expressed concern that leaflets containing political influence had been available at today's SSG meeting. Mr Barr stated that the SSG was a non-political group and felt the person that had left this material had acted inappropriately. Mr Barr suggested that the SSG should write to the person concerned in this regard.

Cllr Elizabeth McLardy made the suggestion that as the SSG were in receipt of various reports ahead of the meeting, that written questions could be submitted to reduce the amount of time spent on questions during the meeting.

Mr Tony Bale took this opportunity to apologise to the SSG for not keeping the meeting on schedule. Mr Bale recognised that whilst it was good to have a healthy debate, discussions must to be kept to the time schedule allocated and he would take this onboard for future meetings. Mr Bale encouraged members to read into the reports beforehand and not ask continuous questions. Mr McGhie felt it would be more beneficial to have a written response to a technical question. He expressed concern that some responses could be lengthy and that questions could be answered in a written form.

In response to the points raised, Mrs Holmes stated that due to the fact that the SSG convened quarterly and they had several reports from various bodies to review, she felt it important that questions were asked verbally at the meeting as this allowed members of the public audience to be given clarification or explanation of points raised. Mr Bale responded that comments would be taken onboard, however the meeting required to be structured without stifling debate.

12. DATE & VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

The date and venue of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 7 June 2012 within the Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan.

Mr Tony Bale
SSG Chairman

ACTION LIST

27th Site Stakeholder Group Meeting

Thursday, 8 March 2012

No	Action	Responsible	Target Date	Status/Comments
01	To update the SSG on the issues discussed at the NDA workshop on Radioactive Waste Management in Cockermouth on 28 March 2012.	Mr T Bale	07/06/12	Complete
02	To correspond with Ms Claire Dodd, Scottish Government regarding a Technical Advisory Group workshop and advise the outcome at the next SSG Meeting.	Mr T Bale	07/06/12	Complete
03	Secretariat to amend typographical errors in the previous minutes.	Secretariat	07/06/12	Complete
04	Further information regarding Hydrazine to be forwarded to Mrs R Holmes, Vice Chair.	Mr A Taylor	07/06/12	Complete
05	Invitation to be extended to the Emergency Planning Officer at North Ayrshire Council to attend and give a presentation at the next SSG Meeting.	Secretariat & Mr H McGhee	07/06/12	Complete
06	To provide the SSG with the exact number of individuals within the ONR Transport Team.	Mr C Kemp	07/06/12	Complete
07	To report when the final weather barrier would be installed at Hunterston "A".	Mr M Stubbs	07/06/12	Complete
08	To provide feedback from the Council regarding the socio-economic application process.	Cllr A Gallagher	07/06/12	N/A
09	Give consideration towards sending a message of support to Fukushima on behalf of the SSG	Mr T Bale	09/03/12	Complete