

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
SITE RESTORATION SUB GROUP**

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002

**Minutes of the Site Restoration Sub group meeting held on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup>  
November 2010 at 1900 hours in the Pentland Hotel (large lounge), Thurso.**

**Present:**

Cllr George Farlow	Highland Council (chair)
Hamish Pottinger	Caithness Against Nuclear Dumping
Deirdre Henderson	Buldoo Residents Group
Cllr Rick Nickerson	Shetland Islands Council
Pauline Crow	Health Service
Alan Scott	Caithness Contractors Consortium
Anne Chard	Caithness West Community Council
John Deighan	Dounreay Unions
Bob Earnshaw	DSG Chairman

**In addition:**

June Love	DSG Secretariat, DSRL
Simon Middlemas	DSRL, Managing Director
Phil Cartwright	DSRL
Stuart Chalmers	NDA
Michael Moreland	Vulcan (MOD)
Roger Wilson	SEPA

## **MINUTES**

### **1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

George Farlow welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked members for voting him in as Chairman of the sub group.

### **2. APOLOGIES RECEIVED**

Apologies were received by:

- Stuart Currie DNSR
- Alastair MacDonald DSG Honorary member
- Cllr Katrina MacNab Highland Council
- Cllr Steven Heddle Orkney Island Council
- Trudy Morris Caithness Chamber of Commerce
- Gordon Jenkins North Highland College
- Peter Dickenson NII (for Dounreay)
- Ian Bramwell NII (for Vulcan)

### **3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting had been circulated in advance to all members for comments. DSG/SRSG(2010)M001 refers.

There were no comments and therefore the minutes were taken as read.

George Farlow asked members if there were any issues arising from the minutes.

Rick Nickerson asked if members if they had seen the KIKK report. It was agreed that the secretary would circulate this to members.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A001: June Love to circulate KIKK report to all site restoration sub group members for consideration.**

Rick Nickerson asked what actions had been taken in light of the PFR fire which had been reported. Simon Middlemas responded that a number of actions on housekeeping and procedures had been tightened.

Rick Nickerson noted that a new PBO (parent body organisation) contract would be awarded in the next couple of years. He asked for confirmation that the local DSG process would continue. The NDA and DSRL both confirmed that stakeholder engagement would still continue.

**4. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS**

A number of actions were ongoing. Of note:

- DSG(2010)M003/A010: June Love to include deputy sub group chairmen on both site restoration and socio economic sub group meetings.

Following discussion Bob Earnshaw proposed Anne Chard as deputy chair for the site restoration sub group. This was seconded by John Deighan. Therefore, Anne Chard was appointed as the site restorations sub group deputy chair.

- DSG(2010)M003/A012: Secretary to put Shetland Islands Council letter and DSRL's response on next Site Restoration Sub group meeting.

The Secretary noted that this was on the agenda for discussion in the meeting.

- DSG(2010)M003/A015: Secretary to organise a convenient date for members of SCCORS to meet with DSG members (and visit site).

The Secretary noted that a provisional date of the 3<sup>rd</sup> November had been identified. However, due to other commitments this visit was cancelled. The Secretary would work with SCORRS to identify a suitable date for a visit to Dounreay and meeting with the stakeholder group.

- DSG(2009)M004/A008: Secretary to invite COMARE to present their findings once the extended study on cancer excesses in the vicinity of Seascale and Dounreay was complete.

It was noted that work was ongoing on this project and COMARE would be in touch once the study was finalised. *[Secretary's note – the KIKK report would be circulated for members to consider in relation to this action.]*

- DSG(2010)M001/A001: Elizabeth Gray to update DSG on low level waste issues relating to policy (and including licensing issues) at the appropriate time.

This action was ongoing. Rick Nickerson asked when this was likely to be resolved. Simon Middlemas responded that both regulators (NII and SEPA) are actively involved in discussions and DSRL would comply with the legislation. Rick Nickerson added that he was concerned that there was a point when DSRL would have to ensure their documentation was in place and this had the potential to affect facilities across the UK.

Deirdre Henderson added that the Dounreay facility is the first of its kind in the UK and was concerned that other waste storage could be moved to the same site as the LLW facility. Simon Middlemas responded that this would not happen. Intermediate level waste could not go into the repository for low level waste. Scottish Government policy for intermediate level waste was storage above ground. The Low Level waste facility was for that type of waste generated by Dounreay and Vulcan only. He added that the vaults will be sized to deal only with these wastes and if the site is successful with waste minimisation it was unlikely that all six vaults would need to be built.

Deirdre Henderson responded she found it unnerving that there was a potential that only phase 1 of the vaults would be built and added if this was the case why were they not being built on site. Simon Middlemas responded that there were a number of reasons why the facility could not be built on site with sea level rise being one of them. He added that the site has planning permission for the facility and the site will try, as far as practicable, to minimise the impact.

- DSG(2010)M002/A004: Alan Scullion to consider how to best to present sampling results and discuss with Deirdre Henderson to ensure the information is what is required.

This action was ongoing.

- DSG(2010)M002/A007: Simon Middlemas to provide a presentation on the revised decommissioning programme at December DSG.

This action was on schedule for the DSG meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

## 5. **VULCAN UPDATE**

George Farlow noted papers distributed in advance in relation to Vulcan. These being:

DSG(2010)P025: Vulcan update  
DSG(2010)P021: NII report (Jan to March 2010)  
DSG(2010)P022: NII report (Apr to June 2010)  
DSG(2010)P023: DNSR report (April to June 2010)  
DSG(2010)P030: DNSR quarterly report (July to Sept 2010)

Commander Michael Moreland noted

- That the Shore Test Facility was currently shutdown with mechanical problems. Repairs were progressing well and it was expected to resume operation and trials early in the new year.
- Changes to the Ministry of Defence's reactor accident definitions and terminology took place on 3 September 2010. These changes did not reduce the effectiveness of the site's emergency response. The changes allow the site to assess the depth of the problem and identify an appropriate response.
- Three lost time accidents had occurred during September and October. One was a slip and the other two finger injury related. Vulcan site management were looking at the trends to learn from these.

Rick Nickerson asked if the emergency zone for Vulcan had been reduced to dovetail into the Dounreay emergency planning zone. Michael Moreland confirmed that

Vulcan would remain at 2km, to remain consistent with other MOD sites, because the planning arrangements are in place and have been proven and tested. There is a different hazard associated with Vulcan as opposed to Dounreay.

Bob Earnshaw asked whether decisions on the future of Vulcan were still ongoing or whether this had been decided in the defence review. Michael Moreland confirmed that decisions on the future were still awaited.

John Deighan asked what plans there was to get new business in. Michael Moreland said this was a question for Rolls Royce who has publicly said they wish to continue working within the area. The secretary noted that there was a Rolls Royce representative on the DSG socio economic sub group.

Rick Nickerson asked if the sub group could receive a copy of the report for Exercise Lonestar. Michael Moreland agreed to look into this.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A002: Michael Moreland to look into whether he could provide the final report on Exercise Lonestar to the site restoration sub group.**

#### 6. DOUNREAY UPDATE

George Farlow noted that a number of papers had been distributed relating to the Dounreay site. These were:

DSG(2010)P029: DSRL report (up to November 2010).

DSG(2010)P028: NII report (July to Sept 2010)

DSG(2010)P026: SEPA report (up to November 2010).

George noted that DSG had asked DSRL to provide a fuller report to the sub group and he thanked DSRL for responding with a different format.

Simon Middlemas noted the following:

- Safety performance on the site was relatively good.
- NII were continuing to investigate the source transfer.
- Environmental performance was good and discharges were all well within the authorised limits.
- The off-shore clean-up of particles had finished for the season. Further details on the project would be provided later in the meeting.
- The major hazard on the site was continuing to be reduced. 188 batches had now been destroyed in the DFR NaK disposal plant. This equated to around 40% of the hazard. The project was ahead of schedule and a scheduled maintenance shutdown was due in the new year.
- The Dounreay Cementation Plant transfer system had developed a mechanical problem which has now been rectified and the plant is now back up and running
- The final 21 drums were removed from the waste drum store during the quarter and included the problems encountered with the last 3 drums which had been

stuck behind a bent locating pole.

- Joe Kane, CH2MHILL, had been appointed as Commercial Manager for the site and reductions in overhead and support costs were continuing.
- The competition for the site was ongoing and the two companies involved have had a continuous presence on the site over the last few months. The formal dialogue will start before Christmas.
- The site statistics were quite good with one lost time accident in June. In general, however, industry and radiation protection were good.

George Farlow asked if members found the report to be an improvement. Members agreed that it was. Anne Chard asked if it would be possible to add a schematic of the buildings so that members could visualise where the plants were that were being talked about. Simon Middlemas said that this could be done although for security reasons some buildings would not be identified.

Anne Chard asked how many people the barge employed for the particle clean-up work. Simon Middlemas responded that there were 25 people on board working shifts on a 24/7 rotation. Deidre Henderson asked when the work would be finished. Simon Middlemas responded that the barge for now gone for the season and would resume again in April/May time. Phil Cartwright confirmed that the barge had arrived back in Liverpool last Saturday.

John Deighan asked how the early retirement campaign was progressing and whether the numbers for this year had been finalised. Simon Middlemas replied that the site needed to shed 102 posts this year and at this time 106 people had volunteered and this was continuing.

Rick Nickerson asked what audience the report was for. Simon Middlemas said that it was for the DSG. Rick felt that the report was a little bit 'motherhood and apple pie' and would like to see missed targets also reported. Simon Middlemas responded that the site had not missed a significant target this year and therefore there was nothing to report.

Rick Nickerson also noted that there was no mention of the shaft. Simon Middlemas responded that the shaft and silo was one of the projects that was being considered in light of the flat funding for the site. The lifetime plan was still being worked on and the shaft/silo would feature in the plans. At this point the site was reviewing the impact of the funding against the major capital projects.

Alan Scott asked if the report could report on value for money. Simon Middlemas said that this was commercial information and would not be reported. Alan Scott asked if it was possible to list the five main projects on site and report on the progress of these in terms of schedule and money. Simon Middlemas responded that at present no project was behind schedule but would take this on board and report if appropriate.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A003: Simon Middlemas to provide schematic of buildings in site report to DSG and to report on the five main projects in relation to schedule and budget.**

Phil Cartwright, DSRL also provided a briefing to members on the particles clean-up programme. Of note:

- It was with regret that Phil announced the untimely death of Professor Keith Boddy who had been the chairman of DPAG and the more recently formed Particles Retrieval Advisory Group (PRAG). Professor Boddy had made a major contribution to the particles issue. At this time Professor Alex Elliot, (also COMARE chair) was acting chair. The next meeting would take place on the 8<sup>th</sup> December where all the data from the off-shore work would be presented. PRAG's 2<sup>nd</sup> report was due in March 2011.
- The barge had been an issue of concern for some local fishermen. The harbour board had acted as the main contact for these issues. Dialogue had led to agreement of safe transit routes to and from the fishing exclusion zone. One local fisherman had decided to move his fishing gear to the west. The barge arrived at the beginning of August and remained until the third week in October. In times of inclement weather the barge took shelter in Scrabster bay.
- The new remotely operated vehicle (ROV), operated by Land and Marine, weighted 7.5 tonnes and had a 2 metre monitoring width. The monitoring detectors were based on the same system as that provided by Nuvia for land monitoring. The unit on board the barge had a 350 litre sand capacity which allowed the ROV to work on the seabed for a number of hours before detection stopped to allow for the unloading of sand and the segregation of particles.

Anne Chard asked how this was carried out. Phil Cartwright responded that the ROV was returned to the barge. The filtration bags were detached from the unit and loaded on a tray, to segregate the particles and return the 'clean' sand back to the seabed following further monitoring. Phil also noted that at the beginning of operations the system had a few teething problems, however by the end it had performed very well, exceeding the particle retrieval requirement.. A total of 429 particles had been removed from the seabed this year.

It was noted that the barge had been spotted in Scrabster bay at times by the community. It was suggested that when reporting on the overall project it was made explicit that the barge was sheltering from the weather and not looking for particles in Thurso bay. Phil Cartwright agreed to take this on board and thanked members for some useful feedback.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A004: Phil Cartwright to ensure that it is made explicit in reports that the barge is not searching for particles in Scrabster bay and is situated there in times of inclement weather.**

Simon Middlemas said that if members of the sub group wished to visit the barge at the start of next season DSRL would be happy to organise.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A005: Phil Cartwright to liaise with the Secretary when the barge is due back in Caithness to invite members of the DSG to visit the barge before operations started.**

- Phil Cartwright tabled a number of pictures at the sub group outlining where particles had been identified previously by Fathoms and what had been covered by Land and Marine. The seabed area being concentrated on was identified by

DPAG and PRAG as the area where most highly active particles lie.

- This year the number of particles found was less than predicted by DPAG. Discussion on the data will take place with PRAG(D) and it was the site's belief that the best technology was being used. In total, since the start of seabed clean-up 599 particles had been detected and removed from the main plume.
- A small number of particles had been detected but had not been retrieved. As the positions of these was known it will be possible for Land and Marine to go back to the areas where particles were left behind. Previous work carried out continues to show that the higher activity particles do not tend to move very far and there will be an opportunity to go back and see whether they are still in the same location. This will be part of the discussion with PRAG(D).
- A sentry box was also located at the entrance of Sandside bay and one minor particle was found.
- On-shore, DSRL now has a license to monitor Sandside beach. Monitoring commenced in October and regular monitoring is now expected to take place. Three particles were detected and removed from Sandside in October, 2 minor and one relevant.

Rick Nickerson noted that he had been involved with this project at the early stages of stakeholder dialogue and was pleased to see the good progress being made. He asked what the breakdown of particles detected and retrieved were. Phil responded that 81 of the particles were in the significant category, 131 relevant and 218 minor, although analysis of all particles were still to be completed. From the particles retrieved the total activity equated to in the region of  $10^9$  Becquerels Caesium-137.

Rick Nickerson also offered his congratulations on reaching an agreement with the Sandside beach landowner to allow monitoring to be continuous.

- George Farlow noted that NII had submitted a written report – DSG(2010)P028 - and while Peter Dickenson had been unable to attend if members had any questions or wished clarification on anything these would be fed back to Peter. No issues were raised.

DSG(2010)P026 – SEPA report. Of note, Roger Wilson reported:

- SEPA had recognised significant improvements in the site's management procedures.
- SEPA were pleased to see the ventilation system in D1209 was now operational.
- The site was in the process of submitting a hard copy of the application for authorisation for the Low Level Waste facilities to SEPA.
- SEPA also recorded its gratitude to Professor Boddy who will be sadly missed.

Rick Nickerson asked whether SEPA were trying to quantify the source of caesium which was reported in the RIFE report. He asked how the Dounreay site levels compared to other areas across Scotland. Roger Wilson said that a lot was driven by where it rained during the Chernobyl incident. Rick responded by asking whether the DSG can see a comparison of levels in Caesium in this area against other areas.

It was also noted that the RIFE report was available on CDs. The secretary was asked to request copies for members.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A006: Roger Wilson, SEPA to provide information on comparisons of levels of Caesium in Caithness & North Sutherland against other areas.**

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A007: Secretary to request copies of RIFE report in CD format for members of the sub group.**

## **7. NDA UPDATE**

Stuart Chalmers, NDA provided a verbal update. Of note:

- NDA were working with the site on the lifetime plan. The baseline had undergone its 2<sup>nd</sup> review and a few minor issues were identified. The site should be recognised for the huge amount of work on the lifetime plan.
- The comprehensive spending review settlement had now been announced. This had been a good result for the NDA and they were currently considering how the funding would be divided up between the estate.
- As part of the overall re-organisation of the NDA, the Forss office had seen a reduction of four posts. In addition there had been two resignations.
- Site competition was progressing well and the bidders were just about to enter into the formal dialogue phase.

## **8. TRANSPORT OF MATERIALS**

George Farlow noted that at the DSG meeting in December Shetland Islands Council had written to DSG and the site on the transport of enriched uranium to the USA from Wick by air. DSG(2010)C095 refers. The site had responded (see DSG(2010)C107). As per the action placed at the September December the issue had been placed on the agenda for discussion.

Rick Nickerson re-iterated that Shetland Islands Council had serious concerns about the shipment of fuels. He thanked Simon Middlemas for his comprehensive response. He further added that this was perhaps not an issue for DSRL as they were probably told what to do with this material. He did feel, however, that this was a matter for DSG as the shipment of fuels could have the potential to overshadow the good work of the site. Concerns from Shetland Islands Council relate to the potential number of shipments that may take place over the lifetime of the decommissioning programme. There was a potential for 100s of movements.

Rick added that given the National Security Council's recent announcement that the biggest threat is action from terrorists and given the recent activities of terrorists, targeting cargo shipments of fuels could add another dimension for terrorism.

Simon Middlemas responded that this was exactly why information on any movements would not be provided in advance. Security was taken very seriously and the Office of Civil Nuclear Security take an active involvement in this issue.



Rick Nickerson recognised this but stated that he knew colleagues in Shetland and Orkney had concerns in this area and this was something that would continue to be raised as an issue.

Hamish Pottinger disagreed. He personally had been delighted to see the fuel go back to the USA. He added that he had seen the police cars etc but no-one in the area was aware of what was happening and given the security measures this was only right and proper. He added that the quicker the material was removed from the site the better.

Simon Middlemas clarified that the site is not allowed to ship waste because it would be against Scottish Government policy. However, the shipment of fuel is a different category and this is sanctioned by Scottish Government. If the fuel remains on the site then new fuel stores would need to be built. He further added that by having fuel remaining on the site meant that there had to be a police presence which meant a high proportion of the site's budget would be spent on security. For clarity, un-irradiated fuel can go by air while (almost all) irradiated material goes by surface transport. While recognising the issues surrounding terrorism he personally felt that it was detrimental to have material dispersed across the UK and the material could be better defended if it was all in one place. In the case of the USA material this had been an instruction from Government to the NDA and the site was obligated to fulfil this commitment.

Rick Nickerson stated that he understood why there were differing views but added that there was a need to look at the risk assessment. Simon Middlemas responded that there were three potential routes out – by air, sea or rail. Rick Nickerson asked whether DSG had a view on shipping since there had been a couple of near misses in the Pentland Firth in recent times and Shetland islands Council were opposed to this. Given the reduction of tugs in the vicinity this could also add to the detriment potential for shipments.

Bob Earnshaw noted that Rick's comments were specific to Shetland. Most of those living within the local community agree that materials should be removed from the site.

John Deighan added that while he understood Shetland's concerns he did not remember a time when Shetland invited people from Caithness over to discuss areas of concern from potential developments. Rick Nickerson responded this had been raised on numerous occasions and if there was a major incident in Shetland it was unlikely to impact on Caithness while a major incident at Dounreay would have a potential detrimental impact on Shetland. He re-iterated that there was a potential environmental impact if rescue tugs were unavailable in the area.

Phil Cartwright noted that any shipping routes were carefully planned with due regard to different scenarios which could potentially happen, together with contingency plans.

Following discussion it was agreed that the sub group should consider the removal of the tugs which could potentially impact on the Pentland Firth. It was agreed that this would be flagged up to the DSG Socio Economic sub group to consider the impact of the removal of the tugs. Rick Nickerson agreed to send information on the proposals to remove rescue tugs to the Secretary.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A008: Secretary to ask DSG Socio economic sub group to consider the impact of the removal of rescue tugs from the Pentland Firth.**

**9. LOW LEVEL WASTE ISSUES**

Anne Chard reported that she had attended, on behalf of DSG, the presentation on the proposed blasting trials. She found the presentation to be very informative and simply laid out. She had asked about the impact of blasting on underground structures (eg drains, sewers, etc) and had also brought up whether animals would be affected. Responses to how animals would be affected had been addressed and the project team had agreed to come back on questions relating to the underground structures.

Deirdre Henderson noted she had also attended the presentation but was unable to attend the blasting trials. She stated that when the trials were undertaken on site she wanted to be the same distance away with her cattle that she would be if blasting took place at the low level waste facility. She added that she would like Simon Middlemas to stand with her. Simon Middlemas said that he would be happy to do this.

**Action; DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A009: DSRL to ensure that when blasting trials take place on site Deirdre Henderson (plus cattle) and Simon Middlemas are situated in a location which will be the same distance away as if the real blasting was taking place.**

Hamish Pottinger stated that he was affected by low flying aircraft over his farm and had found that the cattle did not pay any attention to the noise.

Simon Middlemas noted that the site did not currently have permission for the blasting. The data provided by the blasting trials at the quarry will be submitted to the Highland Council for consideration before any blasting could go ahead.

Deirdre Henderson also added that the Buldoo residents were not happy with communication between liaison meetings. Part of the blasting trials involved properties being surveyed and this did not happen on the dates organised. Simon Middlemas said that the site had offered condition surveys to ensure there was no damage to properties if blasting was the preferred way forward to start construction of the low level waste facility.

Deirdre Henderson also noted that she had reported a missing gate and had received a visit from the CNC in this connection. The missing gate had caused a lot of bad feeling within the immediate community. Simon Middlemas responded that the gate had been erected as an access route to the foreshore for residents. He noted that someone had stolen the gate and CNC had reported this to Northern Constabulary. The bottom line was that someone had stolen property from DSRL and the site would be considering putting up CCTV surveillance of the LLWR site to ensure that this did not happen again. Deirdre responded that this would be yet another issue for those living in Buldoo.

Deirdre Henderson added that she had spoken to John Thurso, MP about a number of issues relating to the construction of the low level waste facility.

Bob Earnshaw said that DSG had attempted to support Buldoo in the past. When the Buldoo Liaison meeting had been formed DSG had offered to attend these meetings but Buldoo residents had not wanted additional representation. DSG had

previously agreed that the Buldoo Residents Group would work with the site and contractors to discuss issues directly relating to the low level waste facility.

George Farlow asked how the group moved forward on this. Deirdre Henderson stated that Buldoo Residents knew that they would not stop the facility from being built. Simon Middlemas asked what Buldoo wanted from the liaison group meetings. As far as he knew the site had tried to address all issues raised and he now didn't know what else could be done on the way forward. Deirdre Henderson responded that there was more discussion on the socio economic impact of the rundown of the site than there was on other issues. She asked that DSG recognise what is happening to Buldoo residents. George Farlow responded that the group was aware of the impact to the Buldoo residents and that the site was trying to keep communication open with residents.

John Deighan added that the DSG chairman had already provided an explanation. The DSG had fully support Buldoo by funding a study on the potential impact of the facility as well as writing to Highland Council on the planning application. If Buldoo wanted DSG to become involved then clear issues needed to be tabled at the sub group meeting for a full discussion and agreement on the way forward.

George Farlow suggested that Deirdre take the discussion back to the Buldoo residents group and ask them to feedback what issues they would like to take forward as private discussions with the site and those issues they would like DSG to get involved with.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A010: Deirdre Henderson to discuss with Buldoo Residents Group what issues should be considered within the local liaison group and what should be taken forward within DSG.**

Simon Middlemas noted that a DVD had been taken of the blasting trials is anyone wished to see this.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A011: Secretary to get copies of DVD on blasting trials for members.**

#### 10. TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

The secretary stated that a draft response had been written on the NDA draft strategy consultation. This had been circulated to members for comment.

Rick Nickerson said that Shetland Islands Council could not align itself with the DSG response (although they did agree with certain aspects). They would submit their own response to the strategy document. It was agreed that a form of words would be drafted to reflect this in the DSG submission.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A011: Secretary to consider wording in DSG's response to the NDA strategy to emphasise that Shetland Islands Council were not part of the response and would submit their own.**

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A012: All members to respond to secretary with comments on the draft response from DSG to the NDA's strategy.**

#### 11. TOPICS FOR NOTING

George Farlow noted a number of correspondence tabled for noting. These were:

- The draft minutes of the Site stakeholder group chair's forum which was held in September had been circulated. This meeting was held prior to the National Stakeholder Group and much of the debate was on future stakeholder engagement with the NDA.
- The future of NDA stakeholder engagement was also reflected in the summary of the NSG held in September – DSG(2010)C110 refers.
- Bob Earnshaw and June Love had attended the National Stakeholder Group on behalf of DSG and John Deighan was also in attendance representing the unions. .
- The notes of the HSE bulk quantities pre-consultation stakeholder workshops summary report has been issued in final form. (DSG(2010)C098 refers). It was noted that the minutes of this workshop had been amended to reflect comments from DSG regarding the Dounreay low level waste facility.
- There had also been a meeting with Scottish Government on 28<sup>th</sup> September on Scotland's higher activity radioactive waste policy. This was a post consultation information meeting providing feedback received and discussion around the framework for detailed statement of policy and response document. June Love attended the meeting along with Derrick Milnes.
- The Scottish sites meeting had been attended by Bob Earnshaw and June Love. A summary report of the meeting had been distributed (DSG(2010)C112 refers).

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Bob Earnshaw noted that this was the second meeting of this group and this afternoon there had also been a meeting of the socio economic sub group. An issue had been raised at the socio economic sub group meeting in relation to the minutes. Members were asked to note that the minutes circulated initially were in draft and until ratified should not be distributed outside the DSG.

**13. CLOSE**

There being no further business the chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.

**George Farlow**

Site Restoration sub group chairman

6<sup>th</sup> November 2010

## **PROGRESS ON ACTIONS**

### **ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING**

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A001: June Love to circulate KIKK report to all site restoration sub group members for consideration.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A002: Michael Moreland to look into whether he could provide the final report on Exercise Lonestar to the site restoration sub group.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A003: Simon Middlemas to provide schematic of buildings in site report to DSG and to report on the five main projects in relation to schedule and budget.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A004: Phil Cartwright to ensure that it is made explicit in reports that the barge is not searching for particles in Scrabster bay and is situated there in times of inclement weather.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A005: Phil Cartwright to liaise with the Secretary when the barge is due back in Caithness to invite members of the DSG to visit the barge before operations started.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A006: Roger Wilson, SEPA to provide information on comparisons of levels of Caesium in Caithness & North Sutherland against other areas.

Action: DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A007: Secretary to request copies of RIFE report in CD format for members of the sub group.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A008: Secretary to ask DSG Socio economic sub group to consider the impact of the removal of rescue tugs from the Pentland Firth.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A009: DSRL to ensure that when blasting trials take place on site Deirdre Henderson (plus cattle) and Simon Middlemas are situated in a location which will be the same distance away as if the real blasting was taking place.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A010: Deirdre Henderson to discuss with Buldoo Residents Group what issues should be considered within the local liaison group and what should be taken forward within DSG.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A011: Secretary to consider wording in DSG's response to the NDA strategy to emphasise that Shetland Islands Council were not part of the response and would submit their own.

DSG/SRSG(2010)M002/A012: All members to respond to secretary with comments on the draft response from DSG to the NDA's strategy.

### **ACTIONS ONGOING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

DSG(2010)M003/A015: Secretary to organise a convenient date for members of SCCORS to meet with DSG members (and visit site).

DSG(2009)M004/A008: Secretary to invite COMARE to present their findings once the extended study on cancer excesses in the vicinity of Seascale and Dounreay was complete.

DSG(2010)M001/A001: Elizabeth Gray to update DSG on low level waste issues relating to policy (and including licensing issues) at the appropriate time.

DSG(2010)M002/A004: Alan Scullion to consider how to best to present sampling results and discuss with Deirdre Henderson to ensure the information is what is required.

**ACTION COMPLETED**

DSG(2010)M003/A010: June Love to include deputy sub group chairmen on both site restoration and socio economic sub group meetings. *Action complete – Anne Chard proposed as deputy chair for site restoration sub group.*

DSG(2010)M003/A012: Secretary to put Shetland Islands Council letter and DSRL's response on next Site Restoration Sub group meeting. *Action complete – discussed and minuted in DSG/SRSG(2010)M002.*

DSG(2010)M002/A007: Simon Middlemas to provide a presentation on the revised decommissioning programme at December DSG.