

**OLDBURY ON SEVERN POWER STATION  
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE OLDBURY CONFERENCE  
CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 28 JANUARY 2015**

**PRESENT:**

Mr M Lynden (in the chair)	-	Oldbury on Severn Parish Council
Cllr D Dovey	-	Monmouthshire County Council
Cllr C Evers	-	Glos Assoc of Parish & Town Councils
Dr L Hales	-	Co-opted member
Cllr M Hawkins	-	Aust Parish Council
Cllr Ms S Hunter	-	Olveston Parish Council
Mr M Johnson	-	Gloucester Harbour Trustees
Cllr G Vaughan-Lewis	-	Alkington Parish Council
Cllr Ms J Lyons	-	Olveston Parish Council
Mr J McNally	-	Staff Representative
Cllr M Riddle	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Mr B Roberts	-	Thornbury Chamber of Trade
Cllr Ms F Shipston	-	Tytherington Parish Council
Cllr Ms V Tutin	-	Olveston Parish Council
Cllr Mrs P Wride	-	Chair, Berkeley SSG

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Ms K Anderson	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr P Dickenson	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Mr P Reynolds	-	Environment Agency
Mr M Heaton	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms L Miles	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Mrs E Vaughan-Lewis	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms G Coombs	-	Communications Officer
Mr P Ireland	-	Baseline Strategy Manager, Magnox Ltd
Mr P Chilcott	-	EHS&Q Site Inspector
Mr B Delve		
Mr W Gill		
Mr G P Simms		
Mr A Mitchell		
Mr S Rodliffe		
Mrs R Riddle		
Ms L Hutchinson		
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 Ms G Ellis-King, Mr J Jenkin, Mr J Kempster, Cllr G Locke and Ms S Stagg.

## **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

### **(a) Accuracy**

- 3 The minutes of the meeting of this Group held on 31 July 2014 were approved as an accurate record.

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

#### **Site End State (para 24 refers)**

- 4 Cllr Riddle drew attention to the need to remain aware of potential future uses for facilities which might be surplus to requirements on site. It was noted that it would be some years before any such facilities might be due for demolition and also that discussions would take place in due course with Horizon Nuclear Power on facilities which they might wish to use.
- 5 Mr Roberts said that the earlier exercise giving consideration to the preferred end state for the site had included consultation with members of the public via questionnaires circulated over a wide area. It was felt that for such consultation to be meaningful it needed to take account of the views of local residents affected by the site and any developments on it. Cllr Dovey emphasised the need for consultation with residents in Chepstow and Lydney.

#### **Role of the SSG**

- 6 Mr Lynden suggested that it would be appropriate in the near future to review the role of the SSG and its methods of working. He undertook to arrange for copies of the Group's constitution to be circulated to members and invited members to let him have any comments they wished to make in advance of the next meeting.

## **PUBLIC FORUM**

- 7 Mr Lynden invited members of the public to raise any issues which might not arise in discussion later in the meeting. No issues were raised.

## QUARTERLY REPORTS

### Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

- 8 Ms Anderson reported on current NDA issues, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) The National stakeholder event in October had started a process of engagement on the NDA's strategy which was under review for approval by government in March 2016. SSG Chairs would be attending a further meeting in May to consider aspects which had not yet been addressed.
  - (ii) A successful supply chain event during November had been well attended.
  - (iii) NDA had recently published a new copy of its Insight magazine.
  - (iv) NDA was consulting on the content of its Business Plan.
  - (v) Government had approved a recommendation from NDA for changes in the management arrangements at Sellafield. The recommendation followed a review which had concluded that the complex technical issues to be addressed at Sellafield were not well suited to the Parent Body Organisation model which was used for other parts of the NDA's estate. The new arrangements would involve Sellafield Ltd working with a "strategic partner" from the private sector.
  - (vi) SSGs currently operated in accordance with guidance issued by NDA in 2009. It had originally been intended that this guidance should be reviewed in 2012 but this had not been done as the arrangements had appeared to be working effectively. It was now considered appropriate for the guidance to be reviewed; some aspects such as membership and arrangements for voting at meetings had raised issues within some Groups and it was felt that standardised approaches might be helpful. The NDA's guidance was to be reviewed and any comments from members submitted to Mr Lynden before the next meeting would be welcomed.
- 9 Mr Simms suggested that the revised arrangements for management of the Sellafield site might be regarded as an acknowledgement of the failure of the existing arrangements. Ms Anderson said that the PBO model had not worked well due to the sheer size of the site and the technical complexity of the tasks faced. She undertook to provide for members a briefing note prepared for stakeholders on the changes in the management arrangements at Sellafield.
- 10 In response to a question from Cllr Dovey, Ms Anderson said she was confident that the selection of a strategic partner to work with Sellafield Ltd would follow a robust process.

- 11 In response to a question from Cllr Riddle, Ms Anderson acknowledged the need for priority to be given to addressing significant potential hazards at Sellafield but said that the aim of the NDA's strategy was to ensure that appropriate funding was made available for all its sites. Cllr Hawkins emphasised the high quality of engineering work he had seen on a recent visit to Sellafield.

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

- 12 Mr Heaton reported on recent activities at the Oldbury site, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) The Site had maintained high standards of safety performance and had complied with all Operating Rule limits and conditions and all Maintenance Schedule requirements.
  - (ii) During December it had been identified that filter banks associated with two minor environmental discharge routes had not been tested in accordance with Company Standard requirements. Subsequent tests had confirmed the filters to be operating correctly and there was no impact on the environment. The cause of the failure to undertake the required tests was being investigated.
  - (iii) There had been no accidents involving time lost from work since the previous meeting.
  - (iv) Good progress had been made with defuelling operations and more than 60% of the fuel had now been removed from both reactors. The reprocessing plant at Sellafield had been operating satisfactorily and there had been no external constraints on despatches of fuel from the site. Irradiated fuel flasks were being despatched at a rate of three per week and if this rate was maintained defuelling would be completed later this year.
  - (v) Once defuelling operations had been completed there would be a series of checks and inspections to confirm that no fuel remained on site. This was expected to take approximately six months and when completed to the satisfaction of the regulator, would allow the site to move into a decommissioning phase.
  - (vi) Hazard reduction work included the removal of 70,000 litres of hazardous chemicals from the redundant water treatment plant and 80,000 litres of kerosene from the gas turbine plant which was no longer required.
  - (vii) The reactors remained in a natural circulation state with very little decay heat being generated. Proposals were being developed to allow the reactors to be declared as being in a passive cooling state with no requirement for use of the feed water system. This would allow simplification of plant systems and reduce maintenance requirements.

- (viii) Installation of the alternative effluent discharge pipeline was nearing completion.
- 13 In reply to a question from Mr Gill on arrangements for heating facilities on the site, Mr Heaton explained actions taken to meet all requirements for heating areas occupied by personnel with electrical heating systems and to use a package boiler when required in winter for operational heating requirements.
- 14 In response to a question from Dr Hales on the route of the alternative effluent discharge pipeline, Mr Heaton explained its location within the former circulating water culvert. He said that work on the installation of the new pipeline had involved a considerable amount of diving with special safety precautions having been taken.
- 15 In response to comments from Cllr Dovey, Mr Heaton explained actions taken to share experience of decommissioning work and techniques with other Magnox sites. He said that some activities were also of interest to EDF in relation to future work on their plants.

### **Office for Nuclear Regulation**

- 16 Mr Dickenson introduced a report on ONR inspection and regulatory activities relating to the Oldbury Nuclear Licensed Site during the previous quarter. He said that his report, previously circulated to members, followed a standard pattern and he would welcome any comments members wished to make on the format or content of these reports. He drew particular attention to the following:
- (i) Inspections undertaken during the past quarter had included a system inspection of the defuelling route. Mr Dickenson had been pleased to see the changes made in response to the previously reported event involving an irradiated transport fuel flask.
  - (ii) During the exercise to demonstrate the Site's emergency arrangements held immediately prior to the previous meeting of this Group, some areas for improvement and further training had been identified. Following implementation, those improvements had been demonstrated in a shift exercise. Mr Dickenson had been satisfied with the improvements and had been pleased to see the interaction and cooperation between the site and emergency services personnel.
- 17 In reply to a question from Cllr Evers, Mr Heaton gave examples of the improvements in the defuelling route referred to by Mr Dickenson. These included improvements to tooling used within the ponds, improvements in arrangements for cleaning and dealing with any waste arisings, improved procedures for inspection and monitoring, enhanced paperwork control systems and staff training and briefing. He said that efforts to maintain high standards of performance in this area and make further improvements were continuing. Mr Dickinson acknowledged the large amount of work done and the improvements which had been achieved.

## **Environment Agency**

- 18 Mr Reynolds presented a report on the Environment Agency's regulatory activities which had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. He drew particular attention to the following:
- (i) Discharges of radioactivity had remained well within permitted limits. Gaseous discharge rates continue to decline and there was no significant trend in liquid effluent discharges.
  - (ii) Environmental monitoring indicated that potential exposures remained very low; there had been no increase in potential radiation dose rate or any concentration of radionuclides in the environment.
  - (iii) A draft report on the recently conducted radiological habits survey contained no unexpected results.
- 19 Mr Reynolds agreed with the comment made earlier by Mr Heaton that the failure to carry out a test of the filter banks associated with two minor discharge routes had not had any environmental impact.

## **UPDATE ON WASTE STRATEGY**

- 20 Mr Ireland gave an indication of possible changes in strategies for the storage of intermediate level wastes and the treatment of fuel element debris which were being considered following the appointment of Cavendish Fluor Partnership as the new Parent Body Organisation. He emphasised that such changes would be subject to necessary regulatory approvals but the information was being provided at this stage as an indication of current thinking. He said that the approaches proposed by CFP had been included in their bid submitted to the NDA which had resulted in them being appointed as the new Parent Body Organisation. He said that in the current review, account had been taken of preferences identified in the public consultation on earlier proposals. He emphasised that safety and the environment remained the highest priority. The review, which aimed to secure the best value for the taxpayer, included consideration of the packages to be used for ILW storage, the method of treatment of fuel element debris, the treatment of pond skips and the treatment of IONSIV cartridges.
- 21 During discussion on aspects currently under review the following points were noted:
- (i) Consideration was being given to the use of 6 m<sup>3</sup> concrete boxes for the storage of intermediate level wastes as an alternative to the DCIC containers proposed previously.
  - (ii) In response to the high costs and extended timescales experienced with the Magnox dissolution plant at Bradwell, consideration was being given to other approaches. Consideration was being given, with the Low Level Waste Repository, to the possibility of disposing some fuel element

debris, following segregation, as low-level waste. Fuel element debris which could not be treated in this way might be packaged for storage.

- (iii) Consideration was being given to the possible use of storage facilities to accommodate ILW from more than one site.
- (iv) A milling technique developed at Hinkley Point for the decontamination of pond skip components might be used at a central decontamination facility.
- (v) IONSIV cartridges used for the removal of caesium from pond water required treatment and packaging for storage as waste. There appeared to be advantages in carrying out this work at a single site and consideration was being given to transferring some 22 of these cartridges from other sites to Oldbury for processing.
- (vi) Mr Ireland said that these approaches had identified significant potential savings. In particular the use of 6 m<sup>3</sup> concrete boxes represented a significant saving compared with DCICs.
- (vii) Mr Dickinson emphasised the significant regulatory approvals associated with these proposals.
- (viii) Mr Lynden welcomed this early indication of current thinking. He said that issues had been raised by SSG chairmen at an earlier presentation and the need for further information had been identified.
- (ix) In response to a comment by Mr Simms, Mr Ireland said he understood that the PBO contract included incentives to achieve cost reductions and he envisaged that savings resulting from a changed approach would be shared between the NDA and the PBO
- (x) Mr Heaton emphasised that there were a number of issues associated with these potential changes which needed to be addressed within the company as part of its own internal processes before submission to regulators for approval.
- (xi) In response to a question from Ms Anderson, Mr Ireland said that it had been suggested that it might be appropriate to carry out the work on IONSIV cartridges at Oldbury as the station's cooling ponds were the last to be taken out of service.

## **EPCC UPDATE**

- 22 Ms Miles outlined the role of the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee in providing a forum for discussions between the various organisations with responsibilities for preparing plans for dealing with any possible emergency at Oldbury. She said that membership of the Committee included the various emergency services, regulators, the local authority, water company and health service representatives.

- 23 Ms Miles said that the EPCC met twice yearly. Discussions at the meeting held in December included an update on the current plant situation to highlight reductions in potential hazards, discussion on changes in arrangements for reception of contaminated casualties at local hospitals and consideration of arrangements for emergency exercises. She said that the meeting also provided a valuable opportunity for members to exchange information on changes within their organisations.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 24 Mr Mitchell suggested that the iconic nature of the design of the Oldbury power station and its position within the programme of development of nuclear power in the UK would justify its preservation as part of a significant attraction for tourists in the local area. Mr Dickinson questioned whether local funding would be available to pay for such preservation and said that access to the site would raise a number of security and radiological control issues. Ms Anderson said that she would report these comments back to the NDA but emphasised that such preservation was not necessarily consistent with the NDA's role to decommission plants as quickly as possible.

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

- 25 It was noted that the next meeting of this Group would be held at the Oldbury conference centre on a date to be advised.

MJD

2 February 2015