

**OLDBURY ON SEVERN POWER STATION
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP
SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS ARISING AT THE MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 31 JANUARY 2018**

- Chairman Mr Malcolm Lynden welcomed members to the meeting.
- Site Closure Director Mr Mike Heaton reported on the continued safety of activities at the Oldbury Site. There had been no significant safety events and compliance had been maintained with all regulatory requirements.
- Mr Heaton reported that ONR had completed its assessment and accepted a report which demonstrated that there was no longer any potential event on the site which could result in a release of radioactivity requiring the implementation of off-site plans. Personnel were receiving training in new contingency plans for dealing with events on site.
- Mr Heaton reported on the good progress which was being made with decommissioning work, in particular the removal of redundant items from the station's cooling ponds, the installation of equipment to package intermediate level waste items in the ponds and preparatory work to allow the demolition of the turbine hall. He said that planning consent was being sought for the construction of a vacuum drying plant for removing moisture from containers of radioactive waste; this plant was manufactured by a local contractor.
- Mr N Shaw, the newly appointed Office for Nuclear Regulation Site Inspector, reported on his inspection activities on the site. He described his constructive liaison with the site on proposed work programmes and referred to his discussions with Safety Representatives which had demonstrated very positive attitudes.
- A report was received from the Environment Agency on the results of their regulatory and inspection activities at the Oldbury site.
- Mr Bill Hamilton presented a report on behalf of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. He provided an update on the various investigations into the contract placed by NDA for the management of the Magnox and RSRL sites. He reported on a proposed stakeholder event to be held at Berkeley in July which would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the support given to local organisations and activities.
- Mr Hamilton outlined consideration being given within NDA to a possible change in strategy which would allow work on reactor dismantlement and final site clearance to commence much earlier than currently envisaged. He emphasised that no decision had been taken on such a change in strategy at this stage.

**OLDBURY ON SEVERN POWER STATION
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP
MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE OLDBURY CONFERENCE
CENTRE ON WEDNESDAY 31 JANUARY 2018**

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 and Town Councils
Cllr M J Hawkins	-	Aust Parish Council
Mr G Jones	-	Staff Representative
Cllr Mrs H Molyneux	-	Forest of Dean District Council
Cllr G Rawlinson	-	Thornbury Town Council
Mr B Roberts	-	Thornbury Chamber of Commerce
Mr J Stanton	-	Berkeley SSG
Cllr K Sullivan	-	Oldbury on Severn Parish Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr W Hamilton	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr N Shaw	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation
Ms G Ellis-King	-	South Gloucestershire Council
Ms S Stagg	-	James Reed PR for Horizon Nuclear Power
Mr M Heaton	-	Oldbury on Severn Power Station
Ms G Coombs	-	Magnox
Mr G P Simms		
Mr W Gill		
Mr B Delve		
Mr A Mitchell		
Mr M J Davis (Secretary)		

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- 1 Mr Lynden welcomed everyone to this meeting of the Oldbury Site Stakeholder Group. He pointed out that it was necessary to postpone the presentation of an update from Horizon Nuclear Power, which had been included on the agenda, as Mr Flexman who was to have given the presentation was absent through illness. It was hoped that this item would be included on the agenda for the April meeting.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2 Apologies for absence were received from Mr R Green, Dr L Hales, Cllr J Carpenter, Mr T Harding, Mr L Hall MP, Cllr P Wride and Cllr M Riddle.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

(a) Accuracy

- 3 The minutes of the meeting of this Group held on 12 July 2017 and of the joint meeting with members of the Berkeley SSG held on 25 October 2017 were approved as accurate records.

(b) Matters arising

- 4 There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

PUBLIC FORUM

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

REVIEW OF SSG CONSTITUTION

- 6 Mr Lynden pointed out that the NDA had invited the Group to review its constitution. During a brief discussion it was agreed that a review should be undertaken against the guidelines issued by NDA. It was agreed that the review should include consideration of the need for extending membership to any organisations not currently represented on this Group. It was agreed that the review should be carried out by a sub group comprised of the following: Cllr Dovey, Ms Ellis-King, Cllr Hawkins, Mr Lynden, Cllr Mrs Molyneux, Mr Roberts and Mr Simms. The subgroup would report back with recommendations at the next meeting of this Group. Ms Coombs would help to arrange a date for a meeting of this subgroup and would ensure that the members had copies of relevant paperwork.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

Site Closure Director's Report

- 7 Mr Heaton reported on recent activities at the Oldbury site, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) The Site had maintained its high standards of safety performance. There had been no significant events or instances of non-compliance with regulatory requirements. The company's targeted approach towards safety improvement was currently focusing on personal responsibility in delivering excellence.
 - (ii) The ONR had completed its assessment of the company's submission relating to hazards on site and had agreed that there was no longer any potential hazard which could result in a release of radioactivity off-site requiring the implementation of off-site plans. Members of staff were currently receiving training in contingency plan arrangements for dealing

with events on site. Subject to its approval, ONR would in due course issue a Licence Instrument to formally withdraw the Off Site Plan.

- (iii) The removal of "furniture" from the cooling ponds was expected to be completed by early March. The level of water in the ponds had been reduced by some 500 mm in order to prove arrangements for dealing with the surplus water. The level would be reduced further when the removal of furniture was completed and then work would commence on the removal of intermediate level waste items stored within the ponds. In reply to a question Mr Heaton explained that water removed from the cooling ponds was discharged via an approved discharge route to the river.
- (iv) Members were shown a video of equipment which was being prepared for use within the pond to load Ionsiv cartridges (intermediate level waste) into ductile cast iron containers. Mr Heaton outlined the process to be used and explained that after the containers were filled the contents would be dried and the packages sealed before transport to Berkeley for interim storage. The Ionsiv cartridges held in the pond would produce 12 such packages. Some 70 packages in total would be sent from Oldbury for storage at Berkeley.
- (v) Work had been undertaken on the external cladding of some plant areas on the roofs of the reactors to prevent water ingress which might cause deterioration of asbestos to be removed at a later stage in the decommissioning programme.
- (vi) Planning consent was being sought to allow construction of a vacuum drying plant for processing radioactive sludges and resins contained within cuboidal DCIC containers. This plant would be similar to that installed at Berkeley and would be manufactured by a local contractor; it would have an operating life of some three years and would subsequently be removed.
- (vii) Enabling works were continuing to allow the demolition and removal of the turbine hall (currently planned to take place in 2022).
- (viii) Mr Heaton reminded members of the approaching deadline for submission of requests for support under the company's socio-economic funding scheme.

8 In reply to a question from Mr Simms, Mr Heaton said that there had been no lost time accidents and no events requiring medical treatment. He said that various techniques including task observation were used to ensure that appropriate standards were followed and ensure that focus on safety improvement was maintained in changing work circumstances; any "near miss" events were carefully followed up. Mr Simms said that the safety performance achieved at the station was exceptional when compared with other industrial environments. He felt that it reflected the efforts of all staff and should be widely recognised.

- 9 In reply to a question from Mr Lynden, Mr Heaton said that there were currently just fewer than 100 Magnox employees on the Site together with 60 – 70 embedded contractors and 40 – 50 contractors on shorter term projects.

Office for Nuclear Regulation

- 10 Mr Shaw reported on the ONR's inspection and regulatory work relating to the Oldbury Site. He reported on his inspections carried out at the Site. He said that the plant was in generally good condition having relatively recently been an operational site and he recognised the challenge in making arrangements proportionate to the reducing level of hazards on the Site.
- 11 Mr Shaw said that during his visits he had met with Safety Representatives and had been impressed with their positive attitudes towards the site leadership and their engagement with safety matters on the Site. He said that positive attitudes amongst Safety Representatives were a good indication of the Site's culture.
- 12 Mr Shaw confirmed that he had witnessed an exercise of the Site's new contingency plan arrangements; implementation of these arrangements would follow completion of the ONR's formal assessment and approval process. He said that he had been in discussions with the team working on the equipment for packaging the Ionsiv cartridges within the ponds. Discussions of this nature with the personnel involved helped to build confidence in the way the work was being managed and helped to prepare ONR when formal approvals were sought subsequently.
- 13 Mr Shaw said that the language used in ONR reports to SSGs reflected the formal legal regulatory relationship but often did not do justice to the many good features which were observed, for example, during compliance inspections.
- 14 In response to a comment by Mr Lynden, Mr Heaton undertook to consider whether in a future report to a meeting of this Group he could provide some film of actions taken during an emergency exercise.

Environment Agency

- 15 In the absence of Mr Green, members noted the report on the Environment Agency's inspection and regulatory work circulated to members in advance of the meeting. No issues were raised on any matter covered in the report.

Nuclear Decommissioning Authority

- 16 Mr Hamilton provided an update on issues of current interest, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) The National Audit Office had published a report on the NDA's award of the Magnox contract to Cavendish Fluor partnership and the Holliday inquiry set up by the Secretary of State had also published interim findings on the procurement process. A final report from the Holliday

inquiry was expected to be published later this year. Members of the Holliday inquiry team would be meeting with representatives of SSGs in due course.

- (ii) Following the success of last year's stakeholder summit, a further similar event was being planned. Mr Hamilton hoped that this would be held at the South Gloucestershire and Stroud College campus on the Berkeley Site in July. He hoped that all members of local SSG's would be able to attend and that the event would demonstrate support given by the Sites to local organisations and activities.
- 17 Cllr Dovey suggested that the proposed stakeholder event could provide a demonstration of the standards of excellence achieved by the Site during construction, operation, and now decommissioning. He felt that a film showing the various stages in the life of the Site would help to give confidence in nuclear power. Mr Hamilton said that lots of film material was available and he would consider whether any might be used at the stakeholder event to demonstrate the pride taken in decommissioning work.
- 18 Commenting on the reported progress with the nuclear archive being established near Wick, Cllr Evers said that records of activities during construction and earlier operation would be helpful during decommissioning. He was concerned that many records and documents held previously at the GDCD office at Barnwood might have been lost.

REACTOR DISMANTLING

- 19 Mr Hamilton referred to discussions at the National stakeholder event last September on a presentation given by a member of NDA's strategy team which had raised the possibility that reactor dismantlement could be brought forward. He said that current plans were based upon a quiescent period of care and maintenance lasting some 85 years before final dismantlement of reactor structures. This approach benefited from the decay of radioactivity which would allow easier access for dismantling work and reduce the volume of materials to be treated as radioactive waste. Mr Hamilton said that since the current approach had been established there had been major developments in techniques which might facilitate remote dismantling work; this and all other aspects would be taken into account in the current review of strategy.
- 20 Mr Hamilton said that the NDA's strategy document approved by government had included a commitment to review the timing and sequencing of reactor dismantlement. If the current review of strategy demonstrated that a case could be made for bringing forward dismantlement then the priorities for carrying out this work at the various sites would be examined. He said that it would not be feasible to carry out a programme of dismantling all reactors simultaneously but if a case for accelerated dismantling was made he envisaged that a programme might start with between one and three sites with subsequent sites learning from their experience.

- 21 Mr Hamilton emphasised that no decision had been taken on a change in strategy and that any change in approach would require government approval. He said that the matter would be discussed again with the Chairs of Site Stakeholder Groups but he was interested to hear the views of members. Comments made during the discussion included:
- (i) Accelerating dismantlement might reduce costs associated with preparations for care and maintenance.
 - (ii) The extent to which it would be possible to retain knowledge which could help during final site clearance would be very dependent upon the timing of dismantlement work at individual sites.
 - (iii) Cllr Rawlinson felt there was a public perception that the reactors were effectively being mothballed because nothing could be done safely to decommission them further at this stage. This perception would need to be changed.
 - (iv) Mr Simms drew attention to the enormous cash flow implications of such a change in approach and questioned whether these financial considerations would be acceptable to government.
 - (v) Mr Mitchell questioned whether the government's confidence in NDA might have been affected by the Magnox contract issues. Mr Hamilton felt that the newly appointed senior personnel at the NDA had the confidence of government.
 - (vi) Cllr Evers said that the current approach had been based upon the techniques available at the time but it would have been assumed that in due course advantage would be taken of developments in remote handling and robotics. He said that discounting the cash flow had been a major factor in determining the timing of the programme.
 - (vii) Mr Simms said that preparatory work might take some 10 – 15 years before dismantling could actually commence. He felt it was not feasible to contemplate dismantling work starting within a short timescale.
 - (viii) Mrs Ellis-King said that shorter timescales might facilitate closer integration between decommissioning and new build construction programmes.

CHAIR'S UPDATE

- 22 Mr Lynden outlined meetings which he would be attending with the NDA and the chairs of other SSGs. He said that his meeting in April would include discussions with members of the Holliday inquiry team. He said that he, and he anticipated other SSG Chairs, would not wish to see a repeat of the competition process for the Magnox contract.

- 23 Mr Lynden drew members' attention to the forthcoming consultation on a geological disposal facility, details of which had been circulated to members.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 24 Mr Mitchell referred to a recent visit he had made to the Hinkley Point B Power Station and C Station construction site. He felt that there would be a high level of interest from members of the public in visits to the Oldbury site, that such visits would be helpful in relation to new nuclear construction and that there were many retired employees who would be willing to act as guides. Mr Heaton said that significant expenditure would be required to provide appropriate and safe access for visitors; the focus of Magnox was to decommission the site and funds would have to be made available if visits to the site were to be arranged. Mr Hamilton said that there were other means of giving publicity to activities on sites – various types of films or perhaps occasional open days. He undertook to give consideration to the comments made by members.

DATE TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

- 25 It was noted that the next meeting of this Group was scheduled to be held on 25 April 2018. Arrangements for the meeting would be confirmed in due course.

MJD
3 February 2018