

**BERKELEY NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE
SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

**SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS ARISING AT THE MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY 7 AUGUST 2019**

- Mr John Stanton welcomed members to the meeting.
- Following the necessary nomination processes, members unanimously elected Mr John Stanton and Mr Cllr Steve Chandler as chair and vice-chair of this Group respectively for the coming year.
- Mr Mike Heaton, Site Closure Director, reported on recent activities at the Site. He said that high standards of safety and environmental performance had been maintained and there were no significant events to report.
- Mr Heaton reported on continued progress with the retrieval of radioactive waste from the vaults on the Site. He described the installation of equipment to control the retrieval and processing of containerised wastes. He said that further modification of this equipment would be required in due course to cater for the use of a crane needed for handling concrete box waste packages.
- Ms Anna Tyler-Revell gave information on progress with the construction of the waste encapsulation plant on the Site. This plant would insert grout into concrete boxes which had been filled with radioactive waste on site and cast a concrete lid over the whole. These completed packages would then be stored in the Interim Storage Facility on the site. It was anticipated that the plant would be used for five years to process the waste on the site and then dismantled.
- Reports were received from the Office for Nuclear Regulation and the Environment Agency on the results of their regulatory and inspection activities at the Berkeley Site.
- Mr Jonathan Jenkin presented a report on behalf of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority, providing an update on issues of current interest.
- Mr Ian Warner provided an update on work being undertaken to consider the optimum end state for each of the former Magnox power station sites. This work followed the issue by the Environment Agency of guidance on requirements for sites to be released from radioactive substance regulation when all work on the sites had been completed.

BERKELEY NUCLEAR LICENSED SITE

SITE STAKEHOLDER GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD AT THE BERKELEY ARMS, BERKELEY ON WEDNESDAY 7 AUGUST 2019

PRESENT:

Mr J Stanton (Chair)	-	Co-opted member
Cllr S Chandler	-	Hamfallow Parish Council
Cllr Dr J Cordwell	-	Gloucestershire County Council
Cllr C Davies	-	Stinchcombe Parish Council
Mr David Drew MP		
Cllr G Langdon	-	Ham and Stone Parish Council
Cllr B Tipper	-	Gloucestershire County Council

IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr J Jenkin	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr M Lynden	-	Oldbury on Severn SSG Chairman
Mr J Beckett	-	Stroud District Council
Mr M Heaton	-	Site Closure Director
Ms A Tyler-Revell	-	Magnox
Mr I Warner	-	Magnox
Mrs E Vaughan Lewis	-	Magnox
Mrs E Ashton		
Mr G Vaughan Lewis		
Mr G Wheeler		
Mr M J Davis (Secretary)		

INTRODUCTION

- 1 Mr Stanton welcomed all those present to this meeting of the Berkeley Nuclear Licensed Site Stakeholder Group.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

- 2 Mrs Vaughan Lewis said that Mr Stanton had been nominated for the position of chair and Mr Chandler had been nominated for the position of vice-chair of this SSG. Members unanimously approved the appointment of Mr Stanton and Mr Chandler as chair and vice-chair of this Group respectively for the coming year.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 3 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Mrs H Molyneux, Mr N Shaw, Rev J McHale, Ms S Gallagher, Dr R MacGregor, Mr C McFarling, Mr S Andrews, and Ms B French

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

(a) Accuracy

- 4 The minutes of the meeting of this Group held on 30 January 2019 were approved as an accurate record.

(b) Matters arising

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

PUBLIC FORUM

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

BERKELEY SITE CLOSURE DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

- 7 Mr Heaton presented a report on current activities at the Berkeley Site, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) Good standards of safety and environmental performance had been maintained. There had been no significant events on the Site since the date of the previous meeting.
 - (ii) The retrieval of wastes from Vault 1 had continued although quantities had been limited by problems with the retrieval equipment. These plant defects would be rectified shortly. A third ductile cast iron container had been filled with waste from the shielded area in the former laboratories.
 - (iii) Equipment was being installed in modular form for the retrieval and processing of containerised waste. Some modification of retrieval equipment would be necessary in due course to allow the installation of a different crane which was capable of handling concrete box waste packages.
 - (iv) Senior executive posts within Magnox had been filled as part of the transition to the company becoming a wholly owned subsidiary of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority with effect from 1 September. The transition to the new arrangements would have little impact upon personnel on the Site.
 - (v) The Site continued to provide socio economic support for various causes and organisations in the local community. Members were invited to contact the Site if they were aware of any causes which might justify such support.

- 8 Ms Tyler-Russell outlined progress with the construction of the Modular Intermediate Level Waste Encapsulation Plant (MILWEP) on the Berkeley site. The following points were noted during discussion:
- (i) This was the first of three similar encapsulation plants being built at Magnox sites. The others were at Hinkley Point and Chapelcross. At Berkeley, construction of the building had been completed and internal equipment was being fitted.
 - (ii) The plant would take 6 m³ concrete boxes which had been filled with waste on the site, fill the boxes with grout and cast a concrete lid over the top. The concrete would then be allowed to cure within the plant before being transferred to the Interim Storage Facility on site.
 - (iii) The plant was expected to be used for five years in processing the waste on the site. At the end of that time it would be dismantled.
- 9 Mrs Ashton asked whether the concrete boxes were equivalent to the DCIC containers as she understood from earlier discussions that DCIC containers were being kept for storage of more highly radioactive waste. Mr Heaton said that the potential preference for the use of DCIC containers expressed at earlier meetings was associated with the nature of specific types of waste and accessibility for filling. In reply to a question from Cllr Davies, Ms Tyler-Revell said that the maximum weight of a concrete box when used with normal density concrete, as was proposed at Berkeley, was 30 tonnes. The weight could be up to 50 tonnes if high density concrete was used. In response to a further question from Mr Vaughan-Lewis on the anticipated external dose rates on the different types of container, Mr Heaton undertook to provide further information for inclusion with the minutes of this meeting.
- 10 Mr Heaton said that DCIC containers were used for the wastes in the shielded area of the former laboratories as these could be moved in and out of the cells more readily than a concrete box.
- 11 In reply to a question from Mr Vaughan-Lewis, Mr Heaton said that a submission seeking regulatory approval for the use of concrete box containers was due to be made during the coming month. It was anticipated that Radioactive Waste Management would completed its assessment by May 2020.
- 12 Cllr Chandler sought an assurance that the anticipated increase in tritium discharges was not related in any way to the puncturing of cans containing radioactive sludges. Ms Tyler-Revell assured him that was the case. She said that the anticipated need for an increased discharge limit for tritium was associated with gaseous emissions from concrete waste packages during the curing process.

UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE FOR NUCLEAR REGULATION AND ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

- 13 It was noted that reports on the regulatory activities of the Environment Agency and the Office for Nuclear Regulation in relation to the Berkeley Site had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. It had not been possible for either organisation to be represented at this meeting.
- 14 Cllr Chandler expressed disappointment that he had not received information on the assessment of potential exposures to members of the public arising from increased discharges of tritium. This information had been promised by Mr Reynolds at the meeting of this Group held on 30 January 2019 (para16 refers). Mr Heaton undertook to ensure that a response was provided.
- 15 Mr Vaughan Lewis referred to the discussions identified in the ONR report between Magnox and ONR inspectors in relation to small ignitions of material in the waste vaults during retrieval operations (ONR Report Section 3 – Non Routine Matters refers). Mr Heaton said that discussions had also taken place at the Nuclear Safety Committee. He said that issues had been resolved to the satisfaction of ONR inspectors and retrieval operations were continuing; briefing on this issue had been provided for operators.

UPDATE FROM NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY

- 16 Mr Jenkin provided an update on issues of current interest, drawing particular attention to the following:
- (i) The NDA had held its third annual stakeholder summit on Anglesey during the past month.
 - (ii) The NDA was undertaking a series of regional roadshow events focusing on strategic developments and the process for selection of a site for a geological disposal facility.
 - (iii) The NDA had published its annual report and accounts. Copies of the report and a summary document were available on the website. Mr Jenkin emphasised that NDA had exceeded its revenue income targets during the past year.
 - (iv) A new process of "mission reporting" on progress was being introduced.
 - (v) A number of senior NDA officers were due to retire in the near future.
 - (vi) Over 11,000 containers of low level waste had been diverted from storage in the Low Level Waste Repository. By diverting these wastes to other recycling or disposal routes valuable capacity at the LLWR had been conserved.

- 17 In response to a question from Mr Lynden, Mr Jenkin said that the judicial review into the conduct of the Holiday Inquiry had not yet reached a conclusion; the Inquiry's report would not be published until these issues had been resolved.

END STATE UPDATE

- 18 Mr Warner provided an update on work being undertaken to consider optimum end states for the former Magnox power station sites when decommissioning work is complete. He drew attention to the guidance which had been issued by the Environment Agency on requirements for the release of sites from radioactive substance regulations (GRR). This guidance identified the possibility of leaving some radioactive waste material on sites as a credible option; this approach would be a change from the existing policy. He explained that after radioactive wastes had been removed from sites, remaining structures, some of which would be underground, would contain radioactively contaminated or activated materials. It was for consideration, within the terms of the Agency's guidance, whether those structures should be removed from sites or left in situ.
- 19 Mr Warner said that the Environment Agency's guidance required each Site to produce a waste management plan and an environmental safety case to identify the optimum end state arrangements and demonstrate safety. He said that work to date had included a characterisation and inventory of wastes and a radiological assessment of the consequences of leaving materials on sites. Indications were that the consequences of leaving materials on sites would result in potential exposures well below levels indicated in the Agency's guidance. It appeared therefore that it would be possible to make a case for leaving some material on sites; further consideration would be needed to identify whether that was the appropriate course of action.
- 20 Mr Warner said that the Environment Agency's guidance required the company to consult with local stakeholders on the preparation of its waste management plans. An initial meeting had been held with regulators and the NDA; the planning authority would be involved in due course. He said that stakeholder events were to be held for each site and such a meeting for the Berkeley Site was planned to be held at the end of the current year. Stakeholder responses would be taken into account in developing a strategy to be submitted for NDA approval in March 2020.
- 21 During discussion Cllr Chandler suggested that the planning authority should be involved in discussions on waste management plans at an early stage so that they were aware of any proposals which might affect other land use planning issues.
- 22 In reply to a question from Mr Wheeler, Mr Warner said that radiological assessments would take into account any possible means by which materials disposed of on sites might in the future be disturbed.
- 23 Mr Stanton asked whether potential end uses might be affected by the disposal of materials on sites. Mr Warner said the intention was that after sites were removed from radioactive substance regulations, future use would be determined by land use planning systems without restrictions due to the presence of any

waste disposed of on the sites. Indications from preliminary work suggested that there would be no such restrictions on future use.

CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE

- 24 Mr Stanton reported on his recent activities on behalf of this Group. He referred to his attendance at the NDA stakeholder summit held on Anglesey during the past month and highlighted issues discussed.
- 25 Mr Stanton outlined suggestions for future joint meetings with the Oldbury SSG which had been discussed at a meeting of that Group earlier in the day. It had been suggested that all future meetings could be held jointly between the two Groups with space allocated on each agenda for discussion of site-specific issues. During brief discussion Cllr Chandler said he felt there were good reasons for keeping the two Groups separate as the Sites were at different stages of decommissioning with different technical and local issues to be considered. Mrs Ashton felt that there was more meaningful discussion of local issues at the separate meetings.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No business.

DATE TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

- 26 It was noted that the next meeting of this Group, a joint meeting with members of the Oldbury SSG, was to be held on Wednesday, 30 October 2019 at the Oldbury Conference Centre.

MJD
20 August 2019