

## **HINKLEY POINT SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

### **SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS ARISING AT THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2017**

- Mr Ron Schroder, Hinkley Point A Site Closure Director, described continuing high safety standards on the Site. He said that attention was focused on ensuring that appropriate actions were taken in response to changing hazards. He said that a formal letter had been received from the Environment Agency following a failure to update monitoring procedures with new radiological information; there had been a potential for waste materials to leave site without appropriate monitoring but this had not occurred.
- Mr Schroder gave details of the major programme of decommissioning work to be carried out at the Site during the coming year. This work included the demolition of the Turbine Hall which would have a major impact on the external appearance of the Site. He said that subject to the receipt of the necessary planning consent, work on the construction of an interim storage facility and a waste encapsulation plant would start during the coming months and would involve an additional 150 - 170 construction personnel working temporarily on the site.
- It was reported that an external communications survey undertaken by Magnox had received a good response from the south-west and a large majority of persons responding had felt that arrangements for communication with the public via the Site Stakeholder Groups were effective.
- Mr Peter Evans, Station Director, Hinkley Point B, reported on continued safe and reliable operation of the plant. He said that it was now more than 10 years since the last nuclear reportable event on the site and more than seven years since the last reportable environmental event. There had been no incidents involving time lost from work during the past year. Mr Evans reported that there had been a small fire involving electrical equipment caused by the ingress of water from a leaking roof; the fire had been extinguished by station personnel and actions taken to repair this leaking roof and others which might have a similar effect on other plant.
- Mr Evans said that Reactor 4 was to be shut down later on the day of this meeting for programmed inspections. Similar inspections would be carried out on Reactor 3 at a later date.
- Mr Fediw reported on additional monitoring of sediments in the River Parrett which had been undertaken by the Environment Agency in response to issues raised by members of the Stop Hinkley group. This additional monitoring had given results consistent with the results of earlier environmental monitoring undertaken by the site and the Environment Agency.
- Members received reports from the Environment Agency and the Office for Nuclear Regulation Site Inspectors. No significant issues had been raised by their work.
- Mr Simon Napper of Radioactive Waste Management Ltd gave a presentation on proposed arrangements for the selection of a site for the development of a geological disposal facility for radioactive wastes.

## HINKLEY POINT SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

### Minutes of the meeting held at Hill House, Otterhampton on Friday 24 February 2017

#### **PRESENT**

Cllr M Caswell (Chairman)	-	Sedgemoor District Council
Mr R Schroder	-	Site Director, Hinkley Point A
Mr P Evans	-	Station Director, Hinkley Point B

#### **Elected Members**

Cllr T Ayre	-	Holford Parish Council
Cllr J Berry	-	Otterhampton Parish Council
Cllr Ms A Bown	-	Somerset County Council
Cllr H Davies	-	Somerset County Council
Mr R Corns	-	Natural England
Mr A Debenham	-	Stop Hinkley
Cllr J Edney	-	Somerset County Council
Cllr R Garner	-	North Somerset Council
Cllr Ms S Goss	-	West Somerset District Council
Cllr R Habgood	-	Taunton Deane Borough Council
Mr A Jeffrey	-	Bridgwater and West Somerset Green Party
Mr M Laver	-	West Hinkley Action Group
Cllr M Phillips	-	Cannington Parish Council
Cllr Ms A Reed	-	Wembdon Parish Council
Cllr M Reid	-	Nether Stowey Parish Council
Cllr J Ridout	-	Fiddington Parish Council
Cllr J Roberts	-	Nether Stowey Parish Council
Mr J Sivyer	-	Stockland Bristol Parish Meeting
Ms M Smith	-	Forum 21
Cllr S Stretton	-	Spaxton Parish Council
Mr T J Williams	-	Kilve Parish Council

#### **Co-opted Members**

Mr M Brown (Vice Chairman)
Mr M Short

#### **Appointed Members**

Mr R Lee	-	Environment Agency
Mr T Fediw	-	Environment Agency
Mr P Dickenson	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Mr M Khan	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Mr T Howes	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Mr R Davies	-	Somerset County Council
Mr D Bamsey	-	Sedgemoor District Council
Mr S Napper	-	Radioactive Waste Management Ltd

Ms A Lillycrop - Radioactive Waste Management Ltd

**EDF Energy**

Mr D Stokes - Communications

Ms A Cowie - External Communications Manager

Mr D Uminski - Technical Safety and Support Manager

Mr J Roberts - Environmental Safety

**Magnox**

Mr R Wynn - Integration Director

Ms G Coombs - Communications

Ms E Burwood - Winfrith and Harwell

Mr S Booth

**IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr M Lynden - Chair, Oldbury SSG

Cllr K Sullivan - Oldbury Parish Council

Cllr T Acton - Oldbury Parish Council

Ms C Marsden

Mr M J Davis - Secretary

**CHANGES TO MEMBERSHIP AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1 Cllr Caswell welcomed all those present to this meeting of the Site Stakeholder Group for Hinkley Point A Site and Hinkley Point B Power Station.
- 2 Apologies for absence were received from Dr R McGregor, Cllr PJS Downing, Cllr M Dewdney, Dr S Harrison, Mr G Alford, Cllr C Morgan and Mrs N Dawson.
- 3 It was noted that there were sufficient members present to constitute a quorum for this meeting.

**OPEN PUBLIC QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

- 4 Cllr Caswell invited questions from members of the public on any issue which might not be covered in later discussion. No such issues were raised.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2016**

**(a) Accuracy**

- 5 The minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2016 were approved as a correct record.

**(b) Matters Arising (other than matters to be covered in later discussions)**

**Removal of pipe bridge (para 7(v) refers)**

- 6 Mr Schroder confirmed that the demolition of the redundant pipe bridge described at the previous meeting had been completed successfully.

**Underground Diesel Contamination (para 7 (vi) refers)**

- 7 Mr Schroder reported that the remediation of underground diesel contamination had been completed to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency.

**Importation of waste skip components from other sites (para 7 (viii) refers)**

- 8 Mr Schroder said that the possibility of importing redundant skip components from other sites for interim storage at Hinkley Point A Site remained an option for consideration as part of the company's overall waste management strategy. No application for consent for such action was being pursued currently.

**Emergency Planning Issues (paras 18 & 19 refer)**

- 9 Mr Davies reported that the results of the survey of local residents on emergency planning issues were still under consideration. In response to a question from Mr Short, he said that there had been no change in the boundary of the detailed emergency planning zone which included part, but not all, of Stockland Bristol; any changes in such boundaries would be determined by the Office for Nuclear Regulation. Mr Sivyer felt that it was inappropriate for parts of the village to be excluded and Mr Short suggested that this matter should be given further consideration.

**CLOSURE DIRECTOR'S REPORT – HINKLEY POINT A SITE**

- 10 Mr Schroder reported on activities at Hinkley Point A Site since the previous meeting, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) High standards of safety had been maintained on the Site, with no recordable injuries and only one minor first aid treatment since the previous meeting. Safety focus was currently on asset management; the need was recognised for heightened awareness and vigilance in relation to the changing nature of hazards on a decommissioning site.
  - (ii) A warning letter had been received from the Environment Agency in relation to a failure to update monitoring procedures in the light of new radiological information. Procedures had subsequently been modified.

- (iii) A large volume of decommissioning work was scheduled for completion in the coming year – some of this would significantly change the external appearance of the site. Demolition of the Turbine Hall was scheduled for November/December after the isolation of all systems and services had been completed.
  - (iv) During the coming year, following further work on the development of techniques, equipment would be installed for segregating and processing fuel element debris wastes. The retrieval of those wastes using the installed equipment would commence in the following year.
  - (v) Construction of an Interim Storage Facility and a waste encapsulation plant was scheduled to take place during the coming year. It was envisaged that a planning application for relocation of the encapsulation plant would be submitted during March/April.
  - (vi) Other significant work during the coming year included the consolidation of intermediate level wastes and further work on asbestos removal.
  - (vii) An external communications survey undertaken during the past year by Magnox had received very positive responses in relation to the effectiveness of SSG arrangements.
- 11 Cllr Caswell emphasised the importance of members visiting the sites to see for themselves the nature of the work undertaken.. He encouraged any member who had not previously visited the sites to arrange to do so via Gemma Coombs.
- 12 Mr Sivyer thanked Mr Schroder for his attendance at a meeting held in Stockland Bristol on the evening prior to this meeting. He felt that the meeting had provided a valuable opportunity for residents to receive information and question Mr Schroder on activities on the A Site. Mr Schroder said he attached great importance to communications with local communities and had enjoyed the meeting.
- 13 Cllr Mrs Bown asked whether the construction of the interim storage facility and encapsulation plant would lead to increased employment opportunities on the site. Mr Schroder said that the construction of these facilities would involve some 150 - 170 contractors' personnel but operation of the facilities would be undertaken by existing site staff. In response to a further question from Cllr Mrs Bown, Mr Schroder said that contractors were asked to provide bus shuttle transport for their staff.
- 14 In response to a question from Cllr Mrs Goss on the implications of the reported failure to update monitoring procedures for wastes leaving the site, Mr Schroder said that there had been a potential for waste to leave the site without appropriate monitoring but this had not happened.

- 15 In response to comments by Mr Debenham, Mr Schroder said that the changed approach towards the processing of Magnox fuel element debris followed experience at Bradwell with construction and operation of a dissolution plant. Encapsulation in concrete offered cost and timescale advantages. The proposed relocation of the encapsulation plant so that it would be adjacent to the interim storage facility would avoid the need for transporting waste packages across the site.
- 16 In relation to Mr Schroder's comments earlier in the meeting about the need for increased awareness and vigilance on a decommissioning site, Cllr Williams asked whether the same safety rules were applied on the A and B sites. Mr Evans confirmed that the safety rules which provided safety from hazards and systems were essentially the same on both sites even though those hazards might be different. Mr Dickenson said that operating rules were changed from time to time to ensure that they remained appropriate for the work and activities to be undertaken.
- 17 In reply to a question from Mr Jeffery, Mr Schroder said that manual sorting of Magnox fuel element debris was continuing in order to help in the development of the design for an automatic system for segregation of higher activity components and to produce an initial quantity of segregated waste for processing. He said that some manual sorting would probably be required after an automatic process had been established in order to deal with high activity components which had become entangled with other waste.
- 18 Replying to a question from Cllr Mrs Reed, Mr Schroder said that there were currently some 180 Magnox staff and 70 contractors' personnel working on the site.
- 19 Mr Short was surprised that work was still needed on asbestos removal. Mr Schroder said that the bulk removal of asbestos had been completed some years ago but there remained residual asbestos as well as quantities of asbestos in smaller areas which had to be dealt.

## **STATION DIRECTOR'S REPORT – HINKLEY POINT B**

- 20 Mr Evans reported on activities and performance at the power station since the previous meeting of this Group, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) It was now more than 10 years since the station had experienced a nuclear reportable event and more than seven years since there had been a reportable environmental event. There had been no lost time incidents during the past year.

- (ii) A small fire in an electrical cubicle had been caused by water ingress through a leaking roof. The fire had been quickly extinguished by station staff. The leaking roof had been repaired; other potential sources of water ingress had been assessed. Some £1 million was to be spent on roofing and civil structure repairs during the coming year.
  - (iii) The review and assessment of the station's periodic safety review by the Office for Nuclear Regulation had confirmed that the station met safety standards. Periodic safety reviews covered a 10 year period of operation; this did not change the current operating lifetime expectation of 2023 for Hinkley Point B.
  - (iv) Reactor 3 had been manually shut down on 3 January for the repair of an 11 KV cable connection on a station transformer. The need for repair had been identified by monitoring using a thermal imaging camera. Following repair the unit had been returned to service on 7 January.
  - (v) Reactor 4 was to be shut down later on the day of this meeting for a programme of planned graphite inspections. Similar inspections would be undertaken on Reactor 3 in April.
  - (vi) The station had completed its programme of emergency exercises to the satisfaction of the Office for Nuclear Regulation.
  - (vii) Two Hinkley Point B apprentices, Danielle Baines and Jon Brockwell, had won an apprentice of the year award.
  - (viii) More than 20,000 people had visited the Visitor Centre in 2016 and the station continued to host large numbers of visitors to the site.
- 21 Cllr Mrs Goss congratulated the station on its excellent record on safety and environmental performance. She expressed thanks for the report circulated in advance of the meeting.
- 22 Cllr Edney commented on the number of events causing plant shutdowns and asked whether this was to be expected with the increasing age of the plant. Mr Evans said that the operational performance of the Hinkley Point B plant during the past 4/5 years had been the best ever achieved. He referred to improvements in condition monitoring which enabled judgements to be taken on removing plant from service for repairs before failures occurred.

## **SEDIMENT MONITORING**

- 23 Mr Fediw reported on additional sampling of sediment in the River Parrett which had been undertaken following discussions with Stop Hinkley members. Sediment samples taken from the river in March and August 2016 had been analysed for

radioactivity in the same way as routine environmental samples; particle size had also been analysed. The results had been consistent with the results of other monitoring of radioactivity in the environment around Hinkley Point. Mr Fediw reminded members of the information on radioactivity in food and the environment published annually by the Environment Agency and the Food Standards Agency. That report indicated that the maximum potential radiation exposure to a member of the public in the vicinity of the Hinkley Point site was 16  $\mu\text{Sv}$  (microSieverts) per year; this compared with the legal annual limit of 1000  $\mu\text{Sv}$ .

24 In reply to a question from Cllr Habgood, Mr Fediw said that the levels of radioactivity in the environment from naturally occurring sources were many times greater than those from man-made sources.

25 Mr Jeffery thanked Mr Fediw for this additional monitoring and acknowledged the open and transparent attitude displayed by the Environment Agency.

#### **ENVIRONMENT AGENCY REPORT**

26 It was noted that a report from the Environment Agency on their monitoring and regulatory activities in relation to the A Site and the B Station had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. No additional issues were raised by members.

#### **GEOLOGICAL DISPOSAL FACILITY**

27 Mr Napper gave details of proposed arrangements for the identification of a site for creation of a deep geological disposal facility for radioactive waste. He said there was general international consensus that geological disposal was the safest means of dealing with these radioactive wastes. A construction licence had been granted in Finland for the creation of an underground disposal facility; this was due to become available for waste disposal from the mid-2020s and would become the first geological disposal facility in Europe..

28 Mr Napper explained that work had been undertaken with the British Geological Survey to gather together information on the geology of the UK and provide a means of high level screening of the various areas of the country against the geological characteristics needed for a safety case. The results of this work would be published before the siting process started. Mr Napper said that consideration had also been given to land use planning aspects and a statement, which would be the subject of public consultation, was due to be published within the next few months. The selection of a site for development of a disposal facility would be dependent upon suitable geological conditions and the support of the local community.

- 29 Mr Brown said that whilst the wastes were dispersed in storage facilities around the country the bulk of the higher level waste was located in the north-west. He felt there seemed to be a logic to locate a disposal facility in that area in order to minimise transport. Mr Napper acknowledged this point but said that wastes were currently transported safely around the country; all means of transport, including sea transport, could be considered; a safety case for a disposal facility would include any transport implications.
- 30 Cllr Caswell said that there would be opportunities at future meetings to keep members informed of progress with the development of proposals for the siting and construction of a geological disposal facility.

### **OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION REPORTS**

- 31 Mr Dickenson and Mr Khan reported on the ONR's regulatory and inspection activities relating to Hinkley Point A Site and B Station. Their written reports had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. The following points were noted during discussion:
- (i) ONR inspectors had powers to carry out inspections at licensed sites at any time. For practical reasons their inspections were generally planned in advance.
  - (ii) All scheduled inspections had been completed satisfactorily. Reports on inspections were available on the ONR website.
  - (iii) ONR had completed its assessment of the periodic safety review of the B Station and had concluded that it was satisfactory.
  - (iv) ONR had been satisfied with the licensee's responses to the fire in a 415V essential services electrical cubicle on 21 November. Those responses had included actions to prevent similar faults on other plant items.
- 32 Cllr Garner suggested that the risk of water ingress might not have been considered in the design of electrical switchgear of the type which had been involved in the fire. Mr Evans pointed out that consideration had been given to the potential impact of water ingress into other areas of plant and actions taken to provide additional protection for electrical equipment where necessary. Mr Khan said that while design standards and expectations could change over time, the licensee was required to demonstrate that risk was minimised by taking appropriate action in the face of foreseeable hazards.

### **UPDATE FROM THE NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY**

- 33 A report from the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority on current issues had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Mr Short drew attention to the

fact that Essex County Council had approved arrangements which would allow wastes from other sites to be stored on site at Bradwell with consequent large savings to the taxpayer.

### **CHAIRMAN'S REPORT**

- 34 A report by Cllr Caswell on his recent activities on behalf of the Group had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Cllr Caswell reminded members of the importance of providing an accurate report when reporting back to their organisations on information presented at meetings of this Group.

### **OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

- 35 No business

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

- 36 It was noted that the next meeting of this Group was scheduled to be held on Friday 23 June 2017 at the Canalside, Bridgwater.

MJD

28 February 2017