

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
SITE RESTORATION SUB GROUP MEETING**

**DSG/SRSG(2011)M005**

**Minutes of the DSG Site Restoration Sub Group meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2011  
at 1900 hours in the Pentland Hotel (large lounge).**

<b>Present:</b>	Cllr George Farlow	Highland Council
	Alastair MacDonald	DSG honorary member
	Bob Earnshaw	DSG Chairman
	Deirdre Henderson	Bulldoo Residents Group
	Cllr Steven Heddle	Orkney Island Council
	Pauline Crow	Health Service
	Anne Chard	Caithness West Community Council
	John Deighan	Dounreay Unions
<b>In addition:</b>	June Love	DSG Secretary
	Steve Beckitt	Decommissioning manager, DSRL
	Phil Cartwright	Particles project Sponsor, DSRL
	Audrey Cooper	Low Level Waste Project Manager
	Michael Moreland	Vulcan (MOD)
	Roger Wilson	SEPA

**1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

George Farlow thanked everyone for attending welcoming Steve Beckitt (deputising for Simon Middlemas) and Audrey Cooper (DSRL's project manager for construction of the low level waste facility) to the meeting for the first time.

**2. APOLOGIES RECEIVED**

Apologies were received from:

Trudy Morris	Caithness Chamber of Commerce
Simon Middlemas	DSRL, Managing Director
Stuart Chalmers	NDA
Stuart Currie	DNSR
Stephen Saunders	ONR (Vulcan)
Peter Dickenson	ONR (Dounreay)
Alan Scott	Caithness Contractors Consortium
Brian Mutch	SGRIP
Cllr Rick Nickerson	Shetland Islands Council

**3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

George Farlow noted that the minutes - DSG/SRSG(2010)M004 – had been circulated in advance to members. The minutes were taken as a true reflection of the meeting and were proposed by Alastair MacDonald and seconded by Steven Heddle.

There were no issues arising from the minutes.

**4. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS**

The chairman noted that a number of actions had been closed out since the last meeting. Appendix 1 shows the status of actions. Of note:

- DSG (2011)M006/A010: Steven Heddle to provide Secretary with copy of Orkney Islands Council's response to Scottish Government's Waste substitution consultation.

This action was now complete – DSG(2011)C218 refers.

- DSG (2011)M006/A013: Simon Middlemas to consider providing more breakdown on projects in the next DSG report.

This action was now complete – DSG(2011)P048 refers.

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

This action is now closed as SCCORS have been invited to nominate a representative to attend DSG meetings.

- DSG(2011)M005/A017: Simon Middlemas to circulate socio economic benefits in contracts when complete.

A draft document was tabled at the meeting. It was agreed that the action (above) be closed out and a new action placed on the Chamber to consult with its members and feedback any comments/input to DSRL. The Chamber could then report progress via DSG Site restoration sub group meetings.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A001: Caithness Chamber of Commerce to circulate DSRL's draft paper on socio economic criteria in contracts for input from members. [Secretary's note: if other DSG members wish to comment these should be passed to the Secretary who will provide comments to Chamber to incorporate into one document].**

John Deighan noted that he had written to Joe Kane asking what benefit Grahams Construction were bringing to the local economy with the award of the low level waste contract. Bob Earnshaw noted that DSG had missed this opportunity and that the contract had been awarded.

Deirdre Henderson said she would like to know how the contract could have been awarded, with the uncertainty on what was to be built. George Farlow thought that Highland Council had missed out on inclusion of planning gain. The secretary said she would ask Commercial for an update on the local benefit on this contract. Steve Beckitt stated that DSRL had to ensure they advertised and awarded contracts under the OJEU legislation.

Actions continuing are:

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. *Action ongoing and transferred to Stuart Hudson – see DSG(2011)C165 for update*

DSG(2011)M004/A020: 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.

## 5. VULCAN UPDATE

Commander Michael Moreland noted that Vulcan was making progress against their programme. The plant was currently shutdown for planned maintenance work and was expected to be back in operation before Christmas.

Vulcan were also responding to questions raised in the wake of the Japanese event.

John Deighan asked if staff numbers were still constant. Michael Moreland responded that there had been no change. John Deighan asked whether Vulcan were planning to take on apprentices again this year. Michael Moreland responded that this was a question for Rolls Royce.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A002: Secretary to request an update from John Owens, Rolls Royce on the number of apprenticeships for the coming year.**

## **6. LOW LEVEL WASTE PROJECT UPDATE**

George Farlow thanked Audrey Cooper for attending the meeting to provide an update on the low level waste project. He noted there had been quite a discussion at the last meeting relating to environmental issues. Audrey stated that Michael Tait had sent his apologies. She said she was not in a position to respond but would provide an update on the project.

Audrey produced diagrams of the low level waste facility site showing the layout of the vaults as it exists right now. She explained that the vaults had now been positioned so that each phase sat side by side. The original plan had been to undertake two excavations (for LLW and VLLW at different ends of the site) but there were a lot of constraints and in an attempt to limit the initial footprint the decision had been taken to bring these together as phase 1.

Phase 1, design and construct, is the contract that was awarded to Graham Construction. The first two vaults are now planned to be positioned closer to the Dounreay site.

Over the next three months, the following activities would take place:

- Fit out site offices and services connection.
- Site investigation to inform detailed design
- Further trial blast
- Ground investigation for grout plant
- Security system for the LLW site.
- Start to move out of Dounreay site offices and into LLW site portacabin in August.
- Complete scheme design
- Commence detailed design
- Main excavation works will commence in October.

George Farlow asked what stage in the plan was the project currently. Audrey responded that DSRL had planning approval to build the facility and by October the planning conditions would come into force. George asked whether regular meetings were held between DSRL and Highland Council Planning. Audrey responded that meetings were held every 2-3 months.

Deirdre Henderson asked why Highland Council (Planning) did not attend the Buldoo Residents Group meeting. Audrey replied that she could not comment on why HC did not attend. George Farlow asked Deirdre Henderson if Buldoo residents would like someone from Highland Council to attend the meetings.

Deirdre Henderson responded that the diagram tabled at this meeting was a different layout to what she had been provided with previously and noted that the layout of the vaults had moved further to the east. Audrey Cooper replied that the diagram was the same as the one tabled at the last Buldoo meeting. Deirdre noted that it was completely different to the one submitted to Highland Council at the planning stage of the project. Audrey Cooper acknowledged that this was the case. Deirdre believed that the new diagram showed quite major changes. Audrey responded that in their discussions with Highland Council the changes were considered to be non material changes and added that she would be happy if Buldoo Residents wished to invite a Councillor to the meetings.

George Farlow said he would strongly recommend to Buldoo residents that they should invite a councillor to the meetings as the Councillor could make sure that HC planning department were enforcing the conditions placed at the planning approval stage. Deirdre Henderson responded that drilling had already started but no-one would accept complaints as the planning conditions did not apply until October when construction was due to commence. Deirdre Henderson re-iterated that she felt that the whole project had changed so dramatically and believed the situation the residents were in was ridiculous. She went on to state that no-one from Planning department would listen to them.

George Farlow said he would get in touch with planning department and would take this forward because if anyone suggests that HC planning is at fault then HC need to be aware of this. Deirdre Henderson responded that she did not know what to think.

Bob Earnshaw asked whether HC planning was aware of the changes. Audrey Cooper confirmed that all the changes had been discussed with Highland Council Planning and that they had indicated that they were non material changes to the original planning application. Deirdre Henderson said she had spoken to David Mudie at the main DSG about the working hours, under the planning conditions, in October. She went on to say that the Buldoo Residents Group were not happy and did not believe that the Buldoo liaison group was working and while this was going on the residents were losing further amenities.

George Farlow asked Deirdre again whether she wished for him, as a Highland Councillor, to take this issue up. Deirdre responded that she did not know. George said it was simply 'yes' or 'no'. Deirdre responded again that she did not know. John Deighan said he thought that the Buldoo Residents Group meeting was set up to raise these issues with Highland Council Planning and DSRL and did not understand why Deirdre did not know whether she could accept the offer of assistance from George. Deirdre responded that she simply did not know. John replied that there was no point in moaning if she could not accept the help being offered.

[Secretary's note: At this point (19:29) Deirdre Henderson left the meeting].

Bob Earnshaw noted that he had been unaware of the changes being made to the layout of the vaults. George Farlow said he had misgivings and acknowledged that he had visited the site when the planning committee had been considering the application. He stressed that it was up to Highland Council Planning to ensure that all the conditions should be carried forward and met fully, unless there was a prior agreement to change the conditions. He felt that Highland Council Planning needed to provide a statement to clarify this situation.

**Action DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A003: George Farlow to discuss issues with Highland Council Planning on low level waste construction to provide clarity of the current situation.**

John Deighan noted that the Buldoo Residents Group had been supported by DSG over the years and that there had been a long standing action for Deirdre Henderson to discuss what support Buldoo residents needed from DSG. This action had not been completed and it was frustrating to know how to provide any support when the residents did not know what support they wanted. Bob Earnshaw said he had hoped that the Buldoo Residents group meeting would have provided a conduit for Buldoo residents to have that discussion with DSRL directly and that any issues that Buldoo felt were not being listened to would come forward to DSG where DSG members could decide how best to support. However, he added, that it was very unclear what Buldoo wanted others to support.

George Farlow said he would speak to Highland Council Planning and ensure that a representative would attend the next Buldoo Residents Group meeting otherwise he felt sympathy towards Buldoo residents because the meetings would be a waste of time if a planning representative was not there to respond to questions. Steven Heddle said he thought it was entirely appropriate that the information came past the DSG as this was an issue that should be of interest to the whole community. He said he had visited the site of the proposed facility and had benefited from an excellent visit. The issues surrounding Buldoo Residents Group was a completely separate issue.

George Farlow said that one of the things that DSG could do is compare the initial planning details and then see how it has changed, but that Highland Council Planning would need to explain whether they believed all was going to according to the planning conditions. DSG could ask why and where and be told if there are changes to the planning conditions. Anne Chard said that this did not just apply to Buldoo Residents as Caithness West Community Council was also an interested stakeholder who lived in the area. Audrey Cooper said she could provide the written conditions which apply. Anne Chard pointed out that from a layperson's prospective she could understand why the view would be that there had been a massive change in what came forward at planning and the changes tabled today.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A004: Audrey Cooper to provide Highland Council Planning conditions for low level waste project.**

Alastair MacDonald asked the meeting to note that he had an interest in the site and had not taken part of any of the discussion.

Audrey Cooper noted that in terms of socio economics Grahams had sub-contracted quite a substantial piece of work to JGC Engineering and other local contracts were also underway. Grahams were keen to use local labour and had contacted the Ormlie Job Club to see if there were suitable candidates for employment.

Phil Cartwright asked that DSG members noted that in terms of the Buldoo residents meeting DSRL also covered a wider range of topics which could potentially impact on the residents, ie LF42, particles, drainage, etc.

Steven Heddle asked whether the work being carried out presently - the trial blast and boreholes - were connected. Audrey Cooper said the boreholes were looking at specifics on the geology of the site. Blasting trials had been undertaken at a quarry earlier in the year and then a further single blast had taken place at the LLW site to understand the vibration in the soil. A number of stakeholders, including Deirdre

Henderson, had been present when this took place. The blast now planned would be a bulk blast to further develop DSRL's understanding of the vibration transmission from the site.

Steven Heddle asked whether blasting was in the contract. Audrey Cooper responded that a submission had been made to Highland Council Planning but a definitive answer had not yet been received. HC would be waiting for the information from the bulk blast trial to help them inform their decision.

Michael Moreland noted that he had been studying the large diagram that had been shown to Buldoo and those current version which had been handed out to members - he stated that he could not see any material difference between the two diagrams, only a change in detail.

Steve Beckitt asked for clarity to the question raised by Deirdre Henderson earlier as to how DSRL could let a contract when the vaults make-up was still unknown. Audrey Cooper responded that the contract awarded was for a design and build target cost contract. The contractor would need to bring innovation to the table to improve on the initial design and the site investigation work currently just started would help to improve the design. The design phase would be an inherent part of the contract moving forward.

Anne Chard asked whether it would be useful to put out some sort of public information leaflet to allow a comparison of the two options which would help people understand the concept of blasting versus excavation. Audrey Cooper agreed this would be a good idea. Audrey added that the DSRL project team, along with members of Grahams construction, would be relocated into portacabins at the Low Level Waste site by mid August. She extended an invitation to members to visit them at any time.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A005: Audrey Cooper to consider a public document to describe the difference between excavation and blasting for the low level waste facility.**

George Farlow thanked Audrey Cooper for her time. Audrey Cooper left the meeting.

## **7. DOUNREAY UPDATE**

### **DSRL update**

Steve Beckitt introduced DSG(2011)P048, DSRL progress report (July 2011). Of note:

- DSRL's performance on safety, environmental and security remained positive. The site had now gone 400 days without a lost time accident. This is the second time DSRL, and its contractors, had exceeded this timescale for lost time accidents.
- The site had experienced a complete loss of electrical power on 23<sup>rd</sup> May due to a north of Scotland-wide power cut due to high winds. Back up systems operated as planned.
- Like Vulcan, DSRL were also responding to questions raised following the Japanese earthquake and tsunami.

- An emergency exercise had taken place on 27<sup>th</sup> May and was declared an adequate demonstration by ONR.
- On projects, DSRL has 18 key targets to meet this financial year relating to hazard reduction. Of the 18, two have been achieved and two are currently behind schedule. The two behind schedule relate to the Dounreay Fast Reactor NaK disposal plant where a blockage occurred in the liquid metal feed system and the decommissioning of D1251 sentencing tanks which started the year behind schedule due to delays that occurred during 2010/11. The programme for the sentencing tanks had been reviewed and it was considered that opportunities exist to recover the slippage.
- A number of key achievements had been delivered with a number of facilities being cleaned up ready for demolition.

Anne Chard asked whether the fault in WRACS was due to problems with the equipment, ie end of life or wear & tear. Steve Beckett confirmed it was wear and tear of a flexible skirt. He explained when the drums are being compacted they move through a flexible skirt which had become cracked. The skirt was not something that was kept as a spare and had to be ordered. A review of the spares required had been undertaken although the plant had performed well over the year and was a reliable piece of kit. When the plant was dismantled to allow the replacement skirt to be fitted the opportunity was taken to carry forward additional maintenance on the plant.

#### **Particles update:**

The Chairman noted that correspondence had been circulated in advance to members. These were DSG(2011)C192 (PRAG(D) annual report), DSG(2011)C223 (letter from Shetland Island Council) and DSG(2011)C224 (DSRL response to C223).

Phil Cartwright provided an update:

- Monitoring of Sandside beach continued uninterrupted. Since October 44 particles had been detected and removed from Sandside beach. The numbers being found were not outwith those predicted by DPAG (Dounreay Particles Advisory Group). The information collected from monitoring Sandside would be passed to PRAG(D) (Particles Retrieval Advisory Group (Dounreay) for consideration and analysis.
- The foreshore continues to be monitored and no particles have been detected since March. This may be because of the quiet summer sea conditions and monitoring will continue in the winter months.
- Members of PRAG(D) visited the barge to look at the Offshore particle retrieval operations. The data from repeat coverage of an area of seabed would allow PRAG(D) to come to a conclusion on the efficiency of the detection system.
- Off-shore monitoring work for this year was to monitor 16.5 hectares of the seabed. Monitoring had exceeded the area due for this year and a further 7.5 hectares from next years work programme had also been completed. Monitoring was undertaken at the east end of the particle plume and a repetition of monitoring was also covered from last year. A detection efficiency trial (4 hectares) was also undertaken.

- The information from the on-shore monitoring would be supplied to PRAG(D) for its August meeting. PRAG(D) would start to consider the work required for next year as well as looking at what DSRL needs to do in terms of moving towards identifying completion criteria.
- DSRL were continuing to progress the BPEO (Best Practical Environmental Option) for particle clean-up and on-shore monitoring will continue which will also be part of evidence in moving toward an end state.
- DSRL were finding fewer particles than DPAG had originally predicted in the particle plume in the off-shore environment. There are a number of possible reasons for this. The reasons include the methods by which DPAG predicted the numbers, the ability of the system to detect all particles, greater mobility of the particles and physical processes such as fragmentation.
- With regard the Shetland Islands Council letter on particles and the efficiency of the detection system. DSRL had provided a response to the issues raised. A lot of the comments made in the letter related to the PRAG(D) report and the site was not in a position to respond on PRAG(D)'s behalf. Phil noted that he was happy to take any questions relating to the DSRL response.

Steven Heddle said he would like to say that Orkney Island Council agree with Shetland Islands Council on a number of the issues raised in Shetland's letter. He noted that on page 5 of the PRAG(D) report mention was made of the density method. Phil Cartwright responded that this was a pictorial representation whereby each particle is assigned an area around it to identify the contours of particle population density. Previously DPAG had carried this out but had calculated it numerically. In the last year a Global Imaging System (GIS) plotting expert had carried out several plots using this methodology. PRAG(D) were interested in these findings but had undertaken their calculations on a smaller kernel size.

Steven Heddle asked if this could be a contributing factor. Phil Cartwright responded that PRAG(D) had considered the way the original figures were built up and the new GIS approach had been matched to use the same general parameters to allow direct comparison. The DPAG figures had been produced on the basis of small areas of particle finds, the number of retrievals carried out by divers and areas of seabed monitoring by the remotely operated vehicle. The DPAG predictions utilised the best data available at that time. The new retrieval and detection system currently being used provides full seabed coverage and is believed by DSRL to provide an updated picture of what is there now.

Phil continued, stating, that the shape of the plume seems to be the same but the number of particles detected are lower than previously estimated by DPAG. At present DSRL present information on 100 m squares while PRAG(D) had been provided the initial data on 20m squares. Work was ongoing to provide consistent data for comparison. Steven Heddle asked if the 20m area produced a similar picture to that of the 100m area. Phil confirmed that there was a similar picture but the contours started to get a bit fuzzier when looking at 100m area.

Steven Heddle asked whether the contouring (page 10 of the PRAG(D) report) was consistent with that of DPAG's model. He asked whether there had been a shift to the north/east. Phil Cartwright confirmed that there had been a slight shift to the north/east. With regard to the DPAG contour lines numbers of particles detected within the contours were lower. So far, however, particle numbers at the edge of the



area were fairly consistent with DPAG report with an estimated one particle per hectare.

Steven Heddle asked if particles were continuing to migrate. Phil Cartwright responded that this was one of the things that DSRL had looked at this year and the data shows that the particle population density has gone down and there would seem to be a slight overall movement.

Steven Heddle noted that Shetland Islands Council were concerned about the detection efficiency. Phil Cartwright responded that there will always be uncertainty, however he believed that the detection efficiency was better than what PRAG(D) was expecting but PRAG(D) need to carry out some calculations to confirm that this was indeed the case.

Steven Heddle welcomed the PRAG(D) report and indicated that he had found it very informative. He felt that Shetland Islands Council raised some valid questions and the uncertainty of the detection system was real. In that respect Orkney Island Council would support the Shetland Islands Council letter. He noted that DSRL, in its response to Shetland, had reported that recovery of particles had been excellent but could not factor into this the detection efficiency. He felt that the detection efficiency was fundamental to this report and to defining an agreed end state. SEPA had indicated, a number of years ago, that the seabed would be cleaned up to pristine condition. PRAG(D) however had indicated that the seabed could not be cleaned up to pristine condition.

Phil Cartwright re-iterated that, following consultation on the best practical environmental option, in terms of the particle plume DSRL was not finding anything different in terms of the shape and fewer particles had been detected which he believed was good news. Part of the work carried out this year had been aimed at the detection efficiency question.

At this point Phil Cartwright read out a statement from PRAG(D) as follows:

*“The Council (SIC) suggests that PRAG(D) has raised serious concerns regarding the efficiency of the ROV, which is not the case. PRAG(D) has suggested that the efficiency of the system is tested to determine the efficiency of the system at detection which will allow refinement of the potential number of particles in the near offshore environment from Dounreay. PRAG(D) understands that this work has, or is to be completed this year, and will be assessed by PRAG(D) at its next meeting. PRAG(D) has on a number of occasions welcomed the work undertaken by DSRL to recover the particles and knowledge of the field efficiency of the systems will allow a more precise estimate of the particle numbers to be derived.*

*The Council (SIC) appears to indicate that there is a “continued lack of information and certainty regarding the number, location and movement of particles in the areas where recovery work is taking place. Whilst PRAG(D) has noted that there is some uncertainty regarding the extent of the plume of particles and the numbers of particles remaining close to the Dounreay site, this is being addressed by the ROV work undertaken both in 2010 and 2011. Detection and subsequent removal of these offshore sources is demonstrably reducing the risk to the public and is providing further refinement of the estimated distribution and number of particles offshore. It is the case that all of the particles detected are removed where possible.*

*It is also noteworthy that the PRAG(D) predecessor body (the Dounreay Particles Advisory Group) stated that “the remediation of the seabed to ‘pristine condition’ by*

*removal of all radioactive fragments is unrealistic” it continued to state that “DPAG considers that the removal of literally any particle is unrealistic and in the case of minor particles, is unnecessary on the grounds of radiological protection of the public.”*

Steven Heddle said he was very pleased to hear that and didn't believe that Orkney or Shetland Councils wanted to use this as a stick to beat DSRL. He commended the work being done.

Alastair MacDonald stated that he believed the site had come a long way since the clean-up project had got underway and there had been a steady improvement in equipment. Phil Cartwright responded that he believed that the site was using the best piece of equipment in the world.

Roger Wilson, SEPA noted that, at the end of the day, SEPA would receive PRAG(D)'s recommendations and then SEPA would consider this under the Radioactive Contaminated Land Regulations.

The secretary reminded members that an observer from DSG was invited to attend PRAG(D) meetings if required. At present P Cartwright provided this link and could take any specific questions forward to the Group.

George Farlow thanked Phil Cartwright for his update.

### **Office of Nuclear Regulation**

DSG(2011)P045 and P047 were circulated to members in advance. The secretary noted that Peter Dickenson was unable to attend this meeting but was happy to respond to any questions raised. In addition the ONR Chief Inspector was visiting site at the end of July and Peter would be happy to take forward any questions if required.

Members reviewed the two papers tabled and no issues were raised.

### **SEPA update**

Roger Wilson apologised for the delay in sending the SEPA report out to members – DSG(2011)P049 refers. Of note:

- SEPA is currently producing the consultation document for Radioactive Substances Act 1993 authorisations.
- A finalised submission from DSRL to the European Commission, under Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty has been reviewed by SEPA. The Commission will respond at the end of 2011 and a favour opinion is required to allow SEPA to carry out the proposed public consultation on any potential draft authorisation.
- SEPA were currently preparing tender documents to obtain independent technical expertise to assist in the review of DSRL's final detailed design plans.
- The Radioactive Substances Authorisation became the CAR (Controlled Activities Regulations) for liquid radioactive discharges.
- SEPA offices in Thurso were now located at Strathbeg House and is now collocated with SEARs.

It was also noted that work to reprofile and cap the Landfill at the east side of the site was due to commence in July. DSRL have worked closely with SEPA on the approach to closure and will install an engineered cap, with sea protection on the north face.

### **Draft event disclosure policy**

The Secretary noted that a draft paper on an event disclosure policy had been circulated to members for consideration. DSG(2011)C221 refers.

The procedures for public communication in the event of an emergency at Dounreay are rapid, well understood and regularly rehearsed. For non-emergency events that are of public interest, standard practice across the industry has been to report these in "site newsletters".

The frequency of Dounreay's "site newsletter" - the performance report - was changed at the request of the site stakeholder group from monthly to quarterly. Consequently, DSRL has reviewed its practice for the timely disclosure of events of public interest. DSRL considered public expectations, the flexibility offered by the Internet and the use of scales that would allow the public to interpret the true significance of an event.

A draft paper sets out proposed criteria for the timely public disclosure of events of radiological, industrial and/or environmental consequence, using established reporting scales to calibrate the reporting frequency.

This will not change the formal reporting requirements to statutory bodies such as regulators. DSRL would welcome views of the sub group on the draft policy and whether members believe this meets public expectations for the timely disclosure of non-emergency events.

It was agreed that members would take the draft paper away to consider and provide the secretary with any comments.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A006: Members of DSG Site Restoration Sub Group to provide comment to the Secretary on DSG(2011)C221 – Draft event disclosure policy, by the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2011.**

### **8. NDA UPDATE**

George Farlow noted that Stuart Chalmers, NDA had tendered his apologies for this meeting. He had provided a written update as follows:

- NDA has published their Annual Report & Accounts of which some key highlights are;
  - Allocation of £12B from the spending review
  - Publication of Revised strategy
  - Improved safety performance across the estate
  - Significant progress in destruction of NaK at DSRL
  - Reduction of 10% in support and overhead costs across the estate
- NDA published credible options paper with a preferred option of transferring material to Sellafield for re-processing. Final decision not likely until late autumn.
- Competition dialogue has closed and the Invitation to Submit Final Tenders has gone out to bidders with returns expected late August.

- Nigel Lowe the new Head of Programme made an informal 3 day visit to Forss and DSRL prior to taking up his role in mid September

The Secretary noted that NDA were now producing monthly update reports for Site Stakeholder Groups – DSG(2011)C208 and C220 refers. No issues were received.

Bob Earnshaw noted that he had attended the NDA Site Stakeholder Group chair's forum and a number of presentations had been provided by NDA. The presentations would be circulated to all members for information.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A007: Secretary to circulate NDA presentations to Site Stakeholder Group Chair's forum to all DSG members.**

#### 9. COMARE AND KIKK REPORT

George Farlow noted that Shetland Islands Council had asked that the COMARE and KIKK report be included in the agenda for discussion at this meeting. Prior to the meeting Shetland Islands Council had also submitted a letter to DSG on the COMARE report.

COMARE had indicated that they would be willing to attend the next sub group meeting to address the points raised by Shetland. Since the representative from Shetland was unable to attend this meeting it was agreed to defer this discussion under the November meeting.

The secretary noted that COMARE had provided a short statement for the sub group but agreed that this would be held over to the next meeting.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A008: Secretary to invite a representative from COMARE to the November Site Restoration sub group meeting.**

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A009: Secretary to put COMARE/KIKK report on agenda for November Site Restoration sub group meeting.**

#### 10. NDA'S CREDIBLE FUEL OPTIONS PAPER

George Farlow noted that the NDA had now published the credible and preferred option for the Dounreay Fast Reactor Breeder fuel (DSG(2011)C222 refers). He noted that the Socio Economic sub group had discussed the paper during their meeting in the afternoon and had agreed to go back to the NDA for further information on the lifetime costs for each option.

Bob Earnshaw stated that it was important for DSG to consider this paper and understand the impacts that the different options will make on the community.

Anne Chard said that she felt that the information in the document was incomplete, it was a poor document, very light on detail and inaccurate, or confusing, information. Road and rail were mentioned as possible transport mechanisms but sea was not considered. The document moved from exotic fuel, to spent fuel, to fuel, to material which helped to confuse the reader. She felt that the terms were not defined and all options were not covered by this document.

George Farlow declared an interest because of his SNP alliance and noted that if further debate on this subject took place at future meetings he would wish to hand over the chair to Anne for this specific topic.

It was agreed that members would consider the options and provide the Secretary with comments by the 19<sup>th</sup> August.

**Action: DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A010: DSG Site Restoration Sub group members to consider the Exotic Fuels – Dounreay Fast Reactor (DFR) Breeder, Credible and Preferred options paper (DSG(2011)C222 refers) and provide comment to the Secretary by 19<sup>th</sup> August 2011.**

**11. CORRESPONDENCE FOR NOTING**

- **Stockholm report:** The secretary noted that a working group had met to review Anne Chard's report and recommendations from her recent visit to Stockholm (DSG(2011)C200 refers). The working group had agreed that a visioning exercise should be carried out and aims and objectives would be drafted for discussion with DSG members before taking forward.
- **Supply chain development:** The NDA had produced a supply chain development paper which had been circulated to members for information. DSG(2011)C214 refers.

**12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no additional business raised. George Farlow thanked members for their input and closed the meeting.

**George Farlow**  
**DSG Site Restoration sub group chairman**  
24<sup>th</sup> July 2011

## **APPENDIX 1 – STATUS OF ACTIONS**

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

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A001: Caithness Chamber of Commerce to circulate DSRL's draft paper on socio economic criteria in contracts for input from members.

[Secretary's note: if other DSG members wish to comment these should be passed to the Secretary who will provide comments to Chamber to incorporate into one document].

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A002: Secretary to request an update from John Owens, Rolls Royce on the number of apprenticeships for the coming year

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A003: George Farlow to discuss issues with Highland Council Planning on low level waste construction to provide clarity of the current situation.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A004: Audrey Cooper to provide Highland Council Planning conditions for low level waste project.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A005: Audrey Cooper to consider a public document to describe the difference between excavation and blasting for the low level waste facility.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A006: Members of DSG Site Restoration Sub Group to provide comment to the Secretary on DSG(2011)C221 – Draft event disclosure policy, by the 5<sup>th</sup> August 2011.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A007: Secretary to circulate NDA presentations to Site Stakeholder Group Chair's forum to all DSG members.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A008: Secretary to invite a representative from COMARE to the November Site Restoration sub group meeting.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A009: Secretary to put COMARE/KIKK report on agenda for November Site Restoration sub group meeting

DSG/SRSG(2011)M005/A010: DSG Site Restoration Sub group members to consider the Exotic Fuels – Dounreay Fast Reactor (DFR) Breeder, Credible and Preferred options paper (DSG(2011)C222 refers) and provide comment to the Secretary by 19<sup>th</sup> August 2011.

### **ACTIONS CONTINUING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

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. *Action ongoing and transferred to Stuart Hudson – see DSG(2011)C165 for update*

DSG(2011)M004/A020: 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.

### **ACTIONS COMPLETE**

DSG(2010)M003/A015: Secretary to organise a convenient date for members of SCCORS to meet with DSG members (and visit site). *Action complete – SCCORS now invited to nominate representative to attend DSG meetings.*

DSG(2011)M005/A017: Simon Middlemas to circulate socio economic benefits in contracts when complete. *Action complete – Chamber to consider proposal and feed back comments to DSRL. New action assigned on Chamber*

DSG(2011)M006/A002: Secretary to invite low level waste project manager to site restoration sub group meeting (20<sup>th</sup> July) to provide an update of the project. *Action complete – DSRL's project manager attending sub group on 20<sup>th</sup> July 2011*

DSG(2011)M006/A004: Bob Earnshaw to write to Rick Nickerson regarding use of videoconferencing facilities for sub group meetings. *Action complete – see DSG(2011)C210.*

DSG(2011)M006/A008: Secretary to send out website link to HSE/ONR website and in particular information on the Japanese event. *Action complete – see <http://www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/fukushima/interim-report.pdf>*

DSG (2011)M006/A009: June Love to circulate Shetland Island Council's response to the Scottish Government's Waste substitution consultation to members of the SRSG. *Action complete – DSG(2011)C190.*

DSG (2011)M006/A010: Steven Heddle to provide Secretary with copy of Orkney Islands Council's response to Scottish Government's Waste substitution consultation. *Action complete – see DSG(2011)C218.*

DSG (2011)M006/A011: Secretary to put COMARE and KIRK report on agenda for next site restoration sub group meeting. *Action complete – on agenda for 20<sup>th</sup> July 2011.*

DSG (2011)M006/A012: Joe Kane to provide information on the collaborative procurement projects to the Secretary. *Action complete – DSG(2011)C191.*

DSG (2011)M006/A013: Simon Middlemas to consider providing more breakdown on projects in the next DSG report. *Action complete – see DSG(2011)P049*

DSG (2011)M006/A013a: All members to consider whether information in DSRL report is adequate or further information is required. *Action complete – no further comments received but see M004/A006.*

DSG (2011)M006/A014: Secretary to send link to DSG members of PRAG(D) report when published on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2011. *Action complete.*

DSG (2011)M006/A015: Secretary to contact NDA to ask for breakdown of £1bn income in relation to revenue and sale of assets. *Action complete – see table below:*

## 2011/2012 Breakdown of Income by Category

Income source	2011/2012 Plan (£m)
Reprocessing and Fuel Manufacturing	348
Electricity Generation	141
Springfields	1
NDA – INS transport	60
Asset Sales	157
MOX contracts	78
Other	82
<b>Total</b>	<b>867</b>

DSG (2011)M006/A017: Secretary to get timeline for the low level waste project and discuss with Chairman a way forward to update the group. *Action complete – this will be put on agenda for the next Site Restoration sub group meeting (July 2011).*

DSG (2011)M006/A018: Secretary to follow up clarification with Scottish Government on update note provided in March (Correspondence 162 refers) - *Action complete – DSG(2011)C199.*

DSG (2011)M006/A019: DSG Site Restoration sub group members to consider the DECC consultation on the management of plutonium (DSG(2011)C154) with a view to agreeing if a response should be submitted. *Action complete.*

DSG (2011)M006/A020: Secretary to put the use of videoconferencing facilities on the DSG business meeting for discussion. *Action complete.*