



Site Stakeholder Group

HUNTERSTON SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP FORTY FOURTH MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY 2 JUNE 2016 AT 1.30 PM AT LAURISTON HOTEL, ARDROSSAN

Present

Magnox Ltd

Mrs Jill Callander (SSG Secretariat)
Mr John Grierson (Scottish Regional Lead)
Mr Sean Marshall (Magnox Communications)
Mr Reuben Phillips (EHSS&Q Manager, Hunterston A)

EDF (Hunterston B)

Mr Colin Weir (Station Director)
Mr Andy Taylor

Community Council Representatives

Mrs Rita Holmes – SSG Chair (Fairlie CC)
Mr John Lamb – SSG Vice Chair (West Kilbride CC)
Mr Douglas MacFarlane (Largs CC)

ONR

Mr Peter Donnelly (Hunterston A)
Mr Ryan Maitland (Hunterston B)

North Ayrshire Council

Cllr Robert Barr (Dalry and West Kilbride)
Cllr Alex Gallagher (North Coast and Cumbraes)
Mr Hugh McGhee (Environmental Health)
Cllr Tom Marshall (North Coast and Cumbraes)

SEPA

Mr Keith Hammond (Hunterston B)

CNC

Mr Alan MacRae (Hunterston B)

Scottish Government

Mr Ewan Young

Hunterston Estate

Mr Angus Cochran-Patrick

In Attendance

Mrs Sheila Adams (Minutes)
Mr Calum Corral (Press, Largs and Millport News)
Ms Marie Girvan (Balfour Beatty)

Mr Tony Bale (Public)
Miss Linda Graine (Public)
Mr Alan Rice (Public)
Mr Ken Tully (Public)

Apologies

Mr Gareth Dew (TU Representative)
Mr Martin Grafton (Closure Director, Hunterston A)
Mr Bill Hamilton (NDA)
Dr Hazel Henderson (NHS Public Health)
Mr Stuart McGhie (Trade Union Rep, Hunterston B)
Cllr Elizabeth McLardy MBE (Dalry and West Kilbride)
Dr Will Munro (Food Standards Agency Scotland)
Mr Ralston Ryder (Hunterston Estate)
Mr Adam Stackhouse (SEPA, Hunterston A)

1. Chairman's Opening Remarks and Declarations of Interest

Mrs Holmes, Chair, welcomed everyone to the forty-fourth meeting of the Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group in the Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan. Mrs Holmes gave a special welcome to Mr John Grierson, Closure Director at Chapelcross site and Scottish Regional Lead for Magnox Ltd. All present introduced themselves. The apologies, as listed above, were read out. There were no declarations of interest.

2. Chair and Vice Chair Updates and Correspondence

Mrs Callander advised that Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group now has a designated electronic mail box and that all contact and queries should be addressed to the SSG Secretariat by emailing hunterston.ssg@magnox.com.

Mrs Holmes reported that since the last SSG meeting in March 2016, she had attended several meetings, on behalf of the Site Stakeholder Group. The Low Level Radiation and Health Conference in Manchester on 18-20 March 2016 heard Professor Keith Baverstock present on genomic instability and its role in health detriment. Mrs Holmes attended the DECC/NGO Forum in London on 23 March. On 15 April, Mrs Holmes was present at a meeting in London with DECC and Dr David Lowry on cyber security, where she learned that banks have the best cyber security, followed by the Nuclear Industry and Ministry of Defence. New nuclear stations are more prone to cyber-attack than existing stations. 20 April and 25 May were the monthly Socio Economics and Site Update meetings, with Mr Grafton, Mr Sean Marshall and Mr Lamb. A DECC meeting was held in Manchester on 16 and 17 May for a SEPA presentation and RWM presentations, followed by a workshop. It appears that Hunterston Site Stakeholder Group was the only SSG to respond to the SEPA consultation by the deadline. Jim Miller and Gordon Craig from North Ayrshire Council's Planning Department were also invited to DECC Meeting in Manchester and Mrs Holmes would have liked more information from Mr Hamilton on the purpose of the Meeting and workshop.

Mrs Holmes considered that the items of particular interest at the Site Stakeholder Group meeting were likely to be EDF's application for variation in transporting waste; the site's release from radioactive restrictions; and the ongoing discussion on the cracking of core bricks.

Mrs Holmes advised that the application for a variation in transporting waste between EDF stations has been decided and SEPA has authorised that Low Level Waste (LLW) can go between Torness and Hunterston B and onward to LLW facilities. Only oily sludge and desiccant Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) will be authorised and it is not intended that it goes into the Hunterston A ILW store but to a facility authorised to accept it. The Scottish Government Ministers could have called this in but did not. There is an ongoing consultation on what standard a decommissioned nuclear licensed site needs to attain before it can be released from radioactive restrictions and no longer needs oversight from the regulators. This is in the early stages. It is important that the regulators get this right so that Councils and communities are not left with contaminated land and buildings. There is some concern from members of the Site Stakeholder Group and public that Hunterston B's core brick cracking poses a threat to the safety of the ageing reactor. There has been a presentation from the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) to reassure North Ayrshire Councillors that it is safe. The Nuclear Regulators have offered further presentations but Mrs Holmes hoped that a presentation could be arranged through the Scottish Councils Committee on Radioactive Substances (SCCORS). This is funded by the NDA and Mrs Holmes had hoped to ask Mr Hamilton for further information but he was not present at the meeting.

3. Actions and Approval of Previous Minutes

In Section 7 on Page 10 of the Minutes of 3 March 2016, Mr Phillips clarified that the Minutes refer to the limits of Solid Low Level Waste but Mr Grafton's response was on Higher Level Waste.

Miss Grainey advised that she had been misquoted as saying the opposite of what she said, in the first paragraph of the Public Questions and Observations on Page 5. 'She was extremely concerned to read in SEPA's report that Higher Activity Waste is not allowed to be transferred' should read 'She was extremely concerned to read in SEPA's report that Higher Activity Waste **may be** allowed to be transferred'.

Cllr Gallagher pointed out that Graphite Disposal Facility (GDF) referred to on Page 10 in the second paragraph of Questions and Observations, should read **Geological** Disposal Facility.

With the above revisions, the Minutes of the meeting of 3 March 2016 were proposed for approval by Mr Robert Barr and seconded by Mr John Lamb.

4. Hunterston B Station Reports

Hunterston B Report – Colin Weir

Mr Weir's report, circulated with the meeting papers, was taken as read.

Under Safety and Environment, Mr Weir was delighted to report that it has been over eight years since the last EDF Lost Time Injury, which is an outstanding record of which the Station is very proud. The 2016 Reactor 4 interim outage was completed during this period with an exemplary performance and safety record. Reactor 4 was taken offline on 15 April and returned to service on 1 May. The outage took 16 days, the main purpose of which was to gather more data on the graphite core ageing process. With regard to the two graphite bricks found to have cracks during the Reactor 4 outage in October 2014, there has been no significant increase in size since the last outage. Further detail on the inspection is included in Mr Weir's report but all findings were as expected and as a result there will be no change to the end of life calculations.

In respect of Environmental Safety, there have been no significant environmental events in the period from February to April 2016. A minor spill of diesel fuel spilled from a tank into a secondary container due to a ball float valve failure was reported.

In Company News, EDF Energy is proud to be recognised for its diversity and inclusion in the list of 'Top 50 Employers for Women'. In the community, a group of staff from Hunterston B Station took part in the Five Ferry Challenge, raising over £1,000 for a Charity which helps families of sick children.

Staffing at Hunterston B Station currently comprises 550 full time staff, which includes 23 apprentices. A recruitment process is underway for Operations Engineers, Operations Technicians, Maintenance Technicians and Group Heads. Vacancies at Hunterston Station can be found on EDF's website at www.edf-energy.com.

Questions and Observations

Mr Cochran-Patrick asked for an explanation of keyway root cracking which was provided by Mr Weir. Earlier in life the bricks crack at the core, later it cracks from the outside into the brick.

Cllr Tom Marshall referred to the presentations on the graphite cracking, both on site to Councillors and Community representatives and to Chief Officers and Elected Members at North Ayrshire Council. Cllr Tom Marshall understood that everybody who had heard the presentations was satisfied with the position with core graphite cracking. Mrs Holmes questioned this and believed that not all Elected Members were comfortable with the position. Mr Weir confirmed that a presentation had been given to North Ayrshire Council and was pleased to receive positive feedback. The Station is trying to be as open and transparent as possible and will do its best to address Councillors' concerns.

Cllr Barr asked if the diesel spillage was reportable. Mr Weir clarified that this was an internal issue but the Station reports all spillages.

Mr Lamb asked what was wrong with the turbine rotor that had gone round Europe. Mr Weir advised that some plates were loose and it was being repaired in Newcastle and will be returned to the turbine at the next outage.

Hunterston B ONR Report

Mr Maitland highlighted the main points in his report, which was circulated with the meeting papers and taken as read. The Reactor 4 outage to inspect the cracked bricks was outwith the period of the report (January – March 2016) and will be reflected in the next report from the ONR. He advised however that the ONR pays close attention to the results of inspections and confirmed that graphite bricks will crack and the cracking is within predicted levels at this stage. He added that several £million has been spent by EDF and the ONR on undertaking inspections.

The Level 1 Demonstration Exercise undertaken on 17 March had an adequate result. While 'adequate' is the ONR's standard industry terminology, Mr Maitland described this as a very good demonstration. With regard to non-routine matters, the ONR had received notification from Bureau Veritas, acting as a competent person under the Pressure Systems Safety Regulations (2000) of a pressure test that had inadequate pressure relieving protection. The ONR sought and received assurances on remedial actions and was satisfied that the site investigations undertaken were appropriate.

The new Chief Nuclear Inspector of the ONR is Dr Richard Savage, who was appointed following the retirement of Dr Andy Hall in November 2015.

The ONR's revised Strategic Plan 2016-2020 was published in March 2016 and sets out the regulation of the sector for the next four years. This is available to view on the ONR website.

Questions and Observations

Mr MacFarlane asked for more information on the pressure tester vessel which failed. Mr Weir explained that this was a test of pressure testing equipment which tests the pressure on other equipment and is typical of any industrial equipment. Mrs Holmes asked who Bureau Veritas are. Mr Weir advised that the testing has to be carried out by a 'competent person'. A business can be the competent person for itself or can sub-contract this work. In this situation, the work was contracted to Bureau Veritas as the competent person, which is a fairly common arrangement in this sector. Mrs Holmes asked who is responsible for deciding that Bureau Veritas is a competent person. Mr Weir clarified that this is the business that they are in and they are third party insurers. He explained that the pressure tester vessel should have had a relief valve but did not. This was the result of a shortfall in training procedures and has been rectified. Mrs Holmes asked how many pressure vessels there are. Mr Taylor advised that there are hundreds and this process is carried out by specialist experts but was not exemplary on this occasion.

Mr Rice asked how long the pressure tester vessel had been used without a pressure relief valve. Mr Weir confirmed that this was only on the one occasion, where the prescribed testing system was not used on that day. Mr Rice pointed out that the Regulations came into effect in 2000 and asked why the correct systems were not in place with 16 years of knowledge. Mr Weir clarified that systems are in place but on this particular day, a temporary system was being used to test the tester vessel.

Mrs Holmes asked for further detail on the Licence Instrument issued on 31 March under Licence Condition 23(5) granting approval to modify an approved operating rule. Mr Maitland responded that there are many Licence Instruments issued and he could not recall specifically what this one related to.

Mrs Holmes noted that EDF Energy has to make a safety case for 30 key safety systems and asked if the public is able to access this information. Mr Maitland replied that this information is held by the Station and it is up to the Station what it publicises. Mr Weir did not know the answer to this offhand. Mr Maitland added that the ONR publishes reports on its website but it does not have detailed information on Safety Cases.

Hunterston B SEPA Report – Keith Hammond

Mr Hammond's report, circulated with the meeting papers, was taken as read. Mr Hammond gave a brief synopsis of the variation to Hunterston's RSA Authorisation in order to provide the Station with more flexibility in disposing of its radioactive waste by transfer to another person, described in more detail in the decision document and available to view on SEPA's website.

Questions and Observations

Cllr Gallagher asked Mr Hammond whether the variation was a relaxation or tightening of the Regulations. Mr Hammond described this as a difficult question and advised that the changes are in Government policy, which may be seen as a relaxation, but other things have to be taken into consideration. Mr Hammond reiterated that specified Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) can be disposed of from Hunterston B. Cllr Gallagher asked if waste created on site is stored on site. Mr Weir clarified that under the revised authorisation, radioactive waste created at either Torness or Hunterston B can be stored at the other site for a short duration but is not intended to remain there. Mr Weir added that there is no intention to store waste from Torness and the probability of the Station using this aspect of the authorisation is rare. Cllr Gallagher asked if the variation was down to a commercial or safety arrangement. Mr Hammond responded that there are various reasons including safety of people, cost and Best Practicable Means Case. Cllr Gallagher asked if the removal of waste to make it safer made it less safe. Mr Maitland replied that Hunterston B station has to comply with Licence Condition 32 Accumulation of Waste and also has to comply with SEPA Regulations. There has to be a balance of accumulation of waste on site and transfer of waste, which may pose a minimal risk. A judgement has to be made on where the level of risk should lie. During transportation, the waste is mobile for a defined period of time and safety arrangements are in place. It was clarified that radioactive oily waste is not always Intermediate Level Waste and can sometimes be Low Level Waste. Mrs Holmes noted that the authorisation only applies to other Scottish sites which relates to EDF sites of Hunterston B and Torness. It was noted that each site has to comply with conditions and waste has to be removed within six months of arrival. Mr Weir confirmed that waste would be stored in International Standards Organisation (ISO) approved containers, for a maximum of six months. Cllr Gallagher asked again if removal of waste would be safer or less safe. Mr Hammond responded that it is not possible to answer with a sweeping statement as the waste has to be dealt in accordance the Best Practicable Means and even though removal is authorised by SEPA, a Safety Case for the receipt of the waste still has to be provided and approved by ONR.

Mr McGhee asked if Intermediate Level Waste from non EDF sites could be transferred to Hunterston, and it was confirmed that this is not the case. Mr Taylor added that Hunterston B has **never** applied to receive Intermediate Level Waste and this has been the subject of some confusion over the last couple of years.

Mr Gallagher noted that a decision from SEPA was on hold for 22 months, then announced after the Scottish Government elections and asked if there was any pressure from the Government, the answer to which was no. Cllr Gallagher noted that the decision could have been called in by the Scottish Government but was not called in and asked if the reasons for this are recorded. Mr Young confirmed that this information is in the public domain and any correspondence from the Scottish Government as part of the consultation will be available on SEPA's website.

Cllr Tom Marshall asked what Intermediate Level Waste means to the man in the street. Mr Hammond replied that the classification is a well-known standard, set by the Government policy. Cllr Tom Marshall asked about the effect of Low Level Waste on the public. Mr Hammond was unable to give a definitive response as there are various factors to be considered, such as amount of radioactivity, amount of shielding, length of time a person is exposed, etc. Cllr Marshall noted that the Planning Permission restricts Intermediate Level Waste to Hunterston A site and it is ILW which has the restriction, not Low Level Waste. Mrs Holmes added that waste can only be transferred to "waste permitted persons" and Hunterston A and B sites are not "waste permitted persons". Mrs Holmes commented that in the past waste had to go to Drigg in Cumbria to be separated but this could now be separated at Hunterston B and go directly to the facility. Mrs Holmes asked if the authorisation would be revisited at a later stage. Mr Taylor advised that this would not be done in the current operational stage of the Station.

Mrs Holmes asked where the Beyond Design Accident emergency equipment is stored for site. Mr Weir advised that this is at Bellshill.

Mrs Holmes asked if there was any more news on the EDF Failed Fuel project. Mr Hammond advised that there was no update and that this is now not an issue for Hunterston B as the Station was been Failed Fuel free since the end of 2015. Each Station was required to submit a Safety Case to the ONR on how it would react if failed fuel was found on site. It was suggested that this would be an appropriate agenda item for a future Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and Mr Young agreed to take this back to the Scottish Government.

Public Questions and Observations

In response to a question on changes to control rods from a gentleman in the public gallery, Mr Weir advised that he responded to his email. Mr Weir confirmed that control rods are used every time a Reactor is closed down and there are twelve additional super articulated rods installed. The nitrogen plant has always been on site as part of the Safety Case and has never been used in 40 years.

Miss Grainey referred to some cynicism of the fact that it has taken two years for SEPA to reach a decision on the variation to RSA Authorisation when the decision was announced one week after the Scottish Government elections. She asked for clarification on oily waste being referred to as Intermediate Level Waste and not Low Level Waste. Miss Grainey further asked if the characteristics of the waste could be changed from ILW to LLW and considered that Scottish Government policy is very different to the SEPA Authorisation. Mr Hammond responded that the variation accords with Government policy including Scotland's Higher Activity Waste policy, which is one of the reasons why it took so long to reach a decision. He confirmed that ILW cannot be

reclassified as LLW unless the radioactivity of the waste falls within the range of LLW due to some treatment of the waste or natural radioactive decay.

Mr Hammond added that the receiving site for the waste will have its own authorisation restrictions and it is the more appropriate place to control disposals of waste. The transmitting site has to be able to meet the acceptance criteria of the receiving site to be able to transfer the waste. Miss Graine asked if Intermediate Level Waste could become Low Level Waste in the six month period that it can be stored for. Mr Hammond responded that ILW is not authorised to be accepted at Hunterston B from other sites and that it could only store ILW that was generated on site. Miss Graine asked how the waste can be safer at Hunterston than Torness. Mr Hammond was unable to answer this question directly as this would have to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Miss Graine asked what changes in previous operations have caused an increase in waste. Mr Hammond advised that this could be due to more frequent cleaning out of tanks. Prolonged storage of waste could lead to additional worker doses and shortage of space so it is preferable for the site to dispose of the waste as soon as reasonably practicable. The oily waste produced by Hunterston B Station can fall into the category of Low Level Waste, or Intermediate Level Waste, depending on the amount of radioactivity it contains.

Mr Young and Mr Hammond offered to discuss the subject with Miss Graine in more detail after the meeting.

Mr Weir and Mr Taylor left the meeting at 2.55 pm.

5. Hunterston A Site Reports

Hunterston A Report – Reuben Phillips

In Mr Grafton's absence, Mr Phillips presented the report on Hunterston A site, which had been circulated with the meeting papers and was taken as read. The site's safety performance continues to be good with no Lost Time Accidents for two years. There had been one very minor First Aid case relating to an injured finger in the reporting period. All workers on site have received a new 'Standards and Expectations' booklet, as part of Magnox's commitment to continuous improvement in EHSS&Q, which defines the standards, expectations and behaviours of all works on Magnox sites and projects. Event reporting standards have been changed as part of a Magnox-wide process to make all forms, terms and techniques uniform across the Magnox estate.

Mr Phillips described the Cleaning and Draining of Ponds and the Sand Filter project, statistics and photographs of which can be seen in the report. The Solid Active Waste Bunker Retrieval (SAWBR) project is making good progress, with Bunker 4 completely cleared out and the double thickness wall being broken through using diamond cutting techniques to access the waste contained in Bunker 3. Eight test runs have been carried out on the Wet Intermediate Level Waste Retrieval and Encapsulation Plant (WILWREP) with an ONR Readiness Inspection completed on the facility in March 2016. Construction of the Solid Intermediate Level Waste Encapsulation (SILWE) Project continues, with concerns on the safety performance of the main contractor being addressed.

The new structure has been in place through Management of Change 8 since 9 May. The long process of Best Fit was completed with the final position resulting in 145 out of 148 employees (98%) achieving their aspirations.

There was one radiological event between January – April 2016 when a small piece of low level radioactive graphite (the size of a 10p piece) was found in an individual's toolbox, outwith the



Nuclear Licensed site but within Hunterston A site. An investigation to establish the circumstances that led to this event is nearing completion and while this is a disappointing event, it was reported by the individual concerned immediately.

The Emergency Preparedness Team continues to train for incidents that may occur on site and was deployed on five occasions between March and mid-May 2016.

Since March 2016, Hunterston A site no longer has obligations under Regulation 9 of the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations (REDDIR), but this in no way affects EDF emergency arrangements at Hunterston B site.

Hunterston A ONR Report – Peter Donnelly

Mr Donnelly's report, provided with the meeting papers, was taken as read. Mr Donnelly reported that January – March had been a busy period for inspections on site. A joint inspection with SEPA had identified a number of shortfalls with Low Level Waste. A plan of work to address the shortcomings has been prepared and further inspections will be carried out. A Specialist Inspector in Radiation is undertaking a rolling programme of inspections across all sites for consistency. The results of the inspections were adequate and quite good in some places. A follow-up inspection by Mr Donnelly and the Human and Capability Specialist Inspector found that not all of the findings from the inspection in February 2015 had been followed up and the site is undertaking further work to address the outstanding items. Mr Donnelly added that there are a number of items not ready with regard to WILWREP relating to plant, individuals and processes. These are not show stoppers but do need to be addressed and the site must be ready for reinspection on 27 June 2016 or delay this.

Mr Donnelly summarised the actions undertaken in respect of Regulatory Activity. All documents referred to are available to view on the website of the ONR.

Questions and Observations

Mr Lamb referred to the two cells in the Sand Filter project which have been decontaminated and cut up and asked where these have been disposed of. Mr Phillips replied that waste has been sent to steel works in Cumbria and sand is being stored in the sludge retention tanks in the WILREP. Eventually this will be moved to drums, encapsulated and stored.

Mr Lamb asked if the site would be ready for the ONR's reinspection on 27 June 2016. Mr Phillips confirmed that the site is working towards this deadline with the intention of meeting it.

Cllr Gallagher referred to item 5 in the ONR report regarding the shortfall in quality of Investigation Reports and asked why a mature organisation does not meet quality standards. Mr Donnelly responded that this referred to the ability of Investigation Reports to get to the root cause of problems.

In respect of item 6 in the ONR report, Cllr Gallagher asked what the shortfalls were in the accumulated radioactive waste. Mr Donnelly advised that technical guidance is considered when inspecting Licence Conditions and the shortfalls related to storage, sealing and identification of waste. Cllr Gallagher asked for more information on this and whether the shortfalls are leading to hazards. Mr Donnelly reassured members that there is no danger to people but weak processes have been identified and require to be addressed to stop significant happenings.

Mr McGhee referred to the table on Page 7 of the Hunterston A report and asked why the annual limits of Radionuclide or Groups of Radionuclides are so high. Mr Hammond replied that SEPA asks the site to evaluate the limits for possible future discharges as well as other circumstances

under normal operation which may require higher limits than usual.

Mrs Holmes noted that Hunterston A site had won two internal Magnox award for its safety performance on site and the SAWBR project and congratulated Hunterston A site on being the best in the Magnox fleet in regard to safety performance.

Mrs Holmes asked how the graphite piece got into the toolbox and why toolkits are allowed outwith contaminated areas. Mr Donnelly advised that he is awaiting a site investigation report before the ONR investigates further. This is not included in this report as it is outwith the reporting period. Mr Phillips advised that there are many radiation and contamination controlled areas on the site, with some like the Ponds containing loose contamination. In areas where there is significant repeated work the tools would remain in the controlled area. However, there are a lot of areas where only a small amount of work requires to be done and it would be very costly to leave tools in each of these areas as a vast amount of tools would be required. Therefore, tools are taken in to these areas but contamination of the tools is prevented as much as possible and tools are controlled on the way in and the way out and have to pass through two sets of monitors. Two individuals did not perform the expected level of checks and investigations into this are ongoing. The individuals concerned were contractors and left voluntarily so no longer work on site. An investigation into cultures and behaviour is ongoing. Cllr Gallagher asked if the ONR is considering whether the culture in the organisation is correct in terms of insufficient reports, accumulation of waste, tool control etc. Mr Donnelly confirmed that the ONR is looking into these shortfalls but he cannot pre-empt the outcome of the investigations. A Specialist Inspector of Performance and Organisation has been assigned to this case. Cllr Gallagher asked about quality management systems. Mr Phillips confirmed that the site uses ISO systems but he is not aware of others.

Mrs Holmes invited Mr John Grierson to comment. She added that Mr Grafton, Site Closure Director, is open and transparent and had reported the incident immediately to the ONR and to the Chair of the Site Stakeholder Group. Mr Grierson reiterated that there was no danger to people and a thorough investigation is being undertaken on site by a Specialist from Chapelcross site. Learning from this will be shared across the Magnox estate.

Hunterston A SEPA Report – Adam Stackhouse

There was no report from SEPA in advance of the meeting and Mr Stackhouse was not present at the meeting.

Hunterston A NDA Report – Bill Hamilton

Mr Hamilton was not present at the meeting and the NDA report, issued with meeting papers, was taken as read.

6. Update from Scottish Government – Ewan Young

Mr Young's report commenced with an update on the Scottish Cabinet, announced by the First Minister, following the Scottish Parliamentary election on 5 May 2016. Due to the resignation of the previous Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs, Food and the Environment, it became necessary for a new Cabinet Secretary to be appointed. In addition, the Minister for Climate Change and Land Reform was not re-elected. The result of this is that the First Minister has taken the opportunity to realign some of the portfolios and introduce new Cabinet Secretary posts to reflect the central focus of the Scottish Government on the education system and the economy.



Site Stakeholder Group

The Radioactive Waste and Nuclear Decommissioning Policy unit now comes under the remit of the Cabinet Secretary for the Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform, Roseanna Cunningham. The post of Minister for Climate Change and Land Reform has not been retained.

In terms of the Higher Activity Waste (HAW) Implementation Strategy, due to the resignation of the previous Cabinet Secretary and the appointment of Roseanna Cunningham as new Cabinet Secretary, it has not been possible at this time to obtain approval to publish the Higher Activity Waste Implementation Strategy.

The original plan was for the previous Cabinet Secretary to present the Implementation Strategy to the Scottish Cabinet at a Cabinet meeting and for the Scottish Government to publish it as soon as possible thereafter. Due to the changes in personnel, it will now be necessary to meet with the new Cabinet Secretary to brief her on the work done to reach this point and seek her views on the original plan in respect of the publication of the Implementation Strategy and a meeting will be scheduled. There are now limitations on Scottish Government activities during the 28 day period before the EU Referendum on Thursday 23 June. While this delay is unfortunate, it is expected that the Strategy can be formally approved soon after the EU Referendum, assuming that the HAW policy remains the same. As advised previously, the Implementation Strategy is expected to include new content on milestones, public engagement and Research and Development. The timeframe of the work involved in delivering the Strategy will take many decades. The Scottish Government aims to continue to work closely with the Site Stakeholder Groups, as the work streams emerging from the Strategy over the coming months and years ahead become clearer.

With regard to the timing of the Scottish Nuclear Sites Group meeting, due to the forthcoming Referendum on the UK's membership of the EU ON Thursday 23 June 2016, the pre-election period for this commenced on Friday 27 May 2016 and will continue until the day of the Referendum. Taking this into account together with the start of the 'summer holiday' period in which the availability of the members will be fragmented, it has been decided that the next meeting of the Scottish Nuclear Sites Group will now take place on Thursday 29 September 2016. The meeting venue will be Conference Room 2, Scottish Government, Victoria Quay, Leith, Edinburgh, with a start time of 10.00 am. This date has been chosen due to a number of factors, including September Site Stakeholder Group meetings, external meetings already in the calendar, as well as the availability of a suitably sized conference room in Victoria Quay. An agenda, together with associated papers as well as a separate request for the respective update reports from the relevant individuals, will be issued closer to the date of the meeting. Mr Young advised that there are already two excellent presentations lined up on two different but relevant topics for the meeting which he is sure will be of great interest to all those who normally attend the meeting. In addition, there will be a number of new people attending as representatives of a number of organisations following changes.

Questions and Observations

Mrs Holmes asked about the presentations at the Scottish Nuclear Sites Group meeting on 29 September 2016 in Edinburgh but Mr Young was not in a position to disclose these at this stage.

7. Public Questions and Answers and Any Other Business

There were no further questions or items of other business raised and Mrs Holmes closed the meeting at 3.35 pm.

8. Next Meeting – Thursday 1 September 2016

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 1 September 2016 in the Lauriston Hotel, Ardrossan, at 1.00 pm for 1.30 pm.



Site Stakeholder Group