

Cllr George Farlow	Highland Council
Alastair MacDonald	DSG honorary member
Bob Earnshaw	DSG Chairman
Ian Leslie	SGRPID
Deirdre Henderson	Buldoo Residents Group
Cllr Steven Heddle	Orkney Island Council
Cllr Rick Nickerson	Shetland Islands Council
Alan Scott	Caithness Contractors Consortium
Anne Chard	Caithness West Community Council
John Deighan	Dounreay Unions
June Love	DSG Secretary
Simon Middlemas	Managing Director, DSRL
Phil Cartwright	Particles project, DSRL
Stuart Chalmers	NDA
Michael Moreland	Vulcan (MOD)
Roger Wilson	SEPA
Peter Dickenson	ONR
Alex Elliott	Acting chair, PRAG(D) / COMARE chairman
Paul Dale	Tech Sec, PRAG(D) / SEPA

1.
George Farlow, Site Restoration sub group chairman, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He thanked Alex Elliott and Paul Dale for attending the meeting. Alex Elliott noted that he was present as the Acting Chair of PRAG(D) to speak to item 7 and not as Chair of COMARE.

2.
Apologies were received from:

Trudy Morris	Caithness Chamber of Commerce
Pauline Crow	Health Service
Stuart Currie	DNSR (Vulcan)
Stephen Saunders	ONR (Vulcan)

3.
The minutes of the last meeting – DSG/SRSG(2011)M005 – had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Steven Heddle noted that his name was spelt wrongly (Secretary's note: minutes have been updated to amend incorrect spelling).

The minutes were accepted as a true record and this was proposed by Steven Heddle and seconded by Alastair MacDonald.

4.

The status of actions is provided in Appendix 1 of this minute. Of note, since the paperwork was distributed the following actions have been addressed:

- DSG(2011)M007/A005: Secretary to write to Highland Council planning stressing the importance of attending DSG meetings.
- DSG(2011)M007/A010: DSRL to address all issues raised on low level waste from the site restoration sub group meeting held in April.
- DSG(2011)M007/A012: DSG to write to NDA to ask for clarification on how they will fill funding gap after completion of all assets are sold.

Assets sales only provide a minor part of the funding for the NDA. The main sources of funding are commercial income and government grant. Asset sales are part of the NDA's plan of business optimisation to maximise revenue from any surplus assets to provide revenue for decommissioning. The overall funding of the NDA will not be significantly impacted when all available surplus assets are sold.

Rick Nickerson said, from his point of view, Dounreay currently receives £150M out of £2.9 billion NDA budget and it would be interesting to see how NDA fill the funding gap in the future.

- DSG(2011)M007/A042: Linda Buchan, SEPA to confirm whether SEPA had been consulted on the shipment of radioactive steam generators from Canada to Sweden.
- DSG(2011)M007/A043: ONR to provide a response as to whether risk assessments for nuclear shipments consider the removal of the emergency tug vessels.
Email from Peter Dickenson on 10th October 2011 as follows "It is my understanding that risk assessments for shipments are not a matter for ONR. However, my transport colleagues have taken the matter up with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCGA), who replied to the question as follows: Risk assessments for shipments are for the consignor of the cargo. The ETV [emergency tug vessels] service has been withdrawn and although we [MCGA] are involved in the efforts to fund and provide a short term service in Scotland post-withdrawal we cannot comment on the impact of these arrangements until the contractual arrangements have been completed."

Anne Chard stated that she did not feel the response to Action 43 (above) was adequate. George Farlow suggested that DSG write to Michael Foxley who is chairing a working group on behalf of the Councils lobbying UK Government to do something about this issue. It was agreed that the item would be put on the business meeting agenda for consideration.

Rick Nickerson thought the response was inadequate. He stated that the licensing or, at least, sanction of all nuclear shipments through UK waters was a matter for OCNS which is now part of ONR. They are required to make security and safety assessments and make judgements on whether intervention measures are available

and appropriate. SEPA also has powers to regulate shipments as was shown recently when they allowed shipments from Rosyth to Sweden. The operator may need to submit their own assessments for ONR to review but sanction is still a matter for the appropriate Government agency.

Peter Dickenson responded that transfrontier shipments by sea are legally complex and have to take into account the International Law of the Sea.

5.

Written updates were received as follows:

- DSG(2011)C260: Vulcan NRTE update, November 2011
- DSG(2011)P050: ONR's Quarterly report for Vulcan, Jan to March 2011
- DSG(2011)P051: ONR's Quarterly report for Vulcan, Apr to June 2011
- DSG(2011)P052: DNSR's quarterly report for Vulcan, July to September 2011

Commander Michael Moreland noted that a Parliamentary statement had been announced on the 1st November about the Ministry of Defence stating that when Vulcan finishes its' current operations there will be no requirement to prototype future reactor cores. From 2015 there will be no nuclear reactor prototype. There will be nuclear associated work until at least 2020 but a final decision on future contracts will be made in late 2014.

The options for the Vulcan site range in options from going into care and maintenance, supporting the nuclear submarine programme right through to decommissioning the site.

Steven Heddle asked for clarification on nuclear associated work. Michael Moreland responded that this could be working with refurbishing activities, supporting the propulsion system but would not be weapons related.

John Deighan asked whether Rolls Royce were trying to get work into the area. Michael Moreland responded that he could not comment on the work of Rolls Royce. Bob Earnshaw noted that Rolls Royce had resigned from DSG and therefore any questions relating to Rolls Royce would have to be written ones.

John Deighan asked how many people would be working on the site after 2015. Michael Moreland responded that Rolls Royce were contractors to MOD. What the future holds in respect of MOD requirements was still being developed and a decision would be made in late 2014.

Since the majority of people working on the Vulcan site are Rolls Royce personnel it was agreed that this would be taken at the business meeting to discuss a way forward in addressing these questions. It was agreed that if members had any further questions they should email the secretary before the DSG business meeting (to be held on 11th November).

6.

Bob Earnshaw noted that a special meeting had taken place on the 19th October to allow all members of the DSG to be updated on the current status of the project. In addition, Buldoo residents had been invited to attend as well as representatives from Scottish Government, Highland Council (Planning), SEPA, ONR, DSRL and the NDA.

A note for the record had been distributed – DSG(2011)C254 refers. (Secretary's note – the presentation has now been appended to this note and is available on the DSG website). Actions placed on DSG have all been completed. Other actions had been transferred to the Buldoo Liaison meeting for progressing.

In addition a paper – DSG(2011)C248 – was tabled which provided responses to all issues raised at previous meetings of the site restoration sub group.

Simon Middlemas noted that a Buldoo liaison meeting had been held on 1st November with the independent chair, Eleanor Scott in attendance.

Alan Scott noted his observation from the meeting on the 19th October was that there existed a total breakdown in trust between the Buldoo residents who attended this meeting and DSRL. The fact that the nearest neighbour of a nuclear establishment apparently has no trust in whatever the establishment management say or do, is in my mind, a far more serious issue than any issues related to fences or flowers and indeed probably the actual building of the LLW facility itself. He noted, that on a more positive note, he was delighted and encouraged to hear that the meeting with Eleanor Scott in the chair had gone well and would hope that the ongoing engagement/reconciliation process will go some way to repair the breach in trust between the parties.

Deirdre Henderson said she would like to thank Alan for what had just been said. She went on to say that she thought Dounreay was lucky to have them as neighbours. She had been surprised by the format that the liaison meeting had taken and there had been a robust discussion on access.

George Farlow stated that he did not want to go over the discussions that had been debated on the 19th October and asked if these were issues that had been addressed at the liaison meeting yesterday.

Deirdre Henderson responded there was no agreement on access to the foreshore. Simon Middlemas added that some Buldoo residents state they have access rights to the shore and DSRL had repeatedly asked them for evidence of this because if access of right of way did exist DSRL would do something about it. DSRL had started to build a new access road but stopped work to allow Buldoo residents to come forward with alternative suggestions which were not forthcoming. DSRL will now build an access road on NDA's land suitable for access for vehicles.

Bob Earnshaw noted that this had been discussed at the liaison meeting and as stated previously these sort of issues need to be resolved at the liaison meeting

Deirdre Henderson stated that following the liaison meeting she had gone down to the fields to take her sheep in to find 'warning – keep out' signs attached to her

fences. Simon Middlemas responded that this was something that Graham Construction had done. As soon as DSRL had received a phone call from Deidre to inform them of these signs the project manager had spoken to the contractor and the signs were taken down within the hour.

Roger Wilson noted that SEPA had sent a consultation document about the landfill to the Buldoo residents and in addition two SEPA representatives had visited to take residents through the issues. Simon Middlemas stated that the landfill was still in the development area.

George Farlow suggested that Buldoo invite a Highland Council access officer to the liaison meetings.

Following a description of the fencing in the coastal area and how their amenity was affected Deirdre Henderson left the meeting at 19:36 hours.

Simon Middlemas said that, in his opinion, the liaison meeting had been a good one with Eleanor Scott doing a very good job of chairing the meeting. He noted Alan Scott's comments (above) and begged to differ in that most of the neighbours around Dounreay had a good relationship with the site. Stuart Chalmers, NDA said that on a personal level there was sympathy for the Buldoo residents however the site had permission to build the facility, it has to be built to achieve the decommissioning of the site and while access to the foreshore can be provided it cannot be through the development area for health and safety reasons.

Rick Nickerson said he appreciated the emotions involved and asked Simon Middlemas whether a new access road could be build after the facility was finished. Simon Middlemas responded that following the completion of the facility the fence would shift and the profile would be different. The access road would remain or it would be dug up dependent on what was required.

Bob Earnshaw noted that DSG had attempted to be an 'honest broker' in this issues that had been raised and this was why the special meeting had been organised.

7.

DSRL report for November was tabled – DSG(2011)P056 refers. Of note, Simon Middlemas reported:

- Safety, environment, security and radiological performance was positive with 500+ mandays without a lost time accident.
- The security fence upgrade was ongoing and progressing well. Local companies had benefited with contracts.
- Decommissioning was going well in the reactors and the fuel cycle area.
- A small pin-hole leak in the liquid metal destruction effluent plant at DFR had resulted in some interesting media reporting. Following an investigation it had been confirmed that the leak was from a T-piece where the contaminated caustic solution from the NaK (sodium/potassium) plant and the acid feed lines join prior to passing through a static mixer.

Peter Dickenson, ONR noted that the plant was designed so if it did leak it would do so safely. He stated it was a credit to the design team that it was detected so

early since the plant had been designed to ensure safety in depth. ONR had no issues on the way the plant was run – it was simply a defect in a component.

Simon Middlemas added that the leak had been detected at a very early stage and was contained inside a shielded cell, inside another cell (defence in depth). This sort of thing would not normally appear on the radar.

Rick Nickerson congratulated DSRL and its contractors for being awarded the British Safety Council 5-star award for both Health and Safety and Environmental Management.

Rick also noted that the D1251 Sentencing Tanks/D9814 Pond Area was currently behind schedule. Simon Middlemas responded that DSRL was due to achieve the milestone by the end of the financial year.

Steven Heddle asked what the 2 INES events were. Simon Middlemas responded that one was a particle which had been retrieved, taken back to site and had ended up on the floor. It had been subsequently agreed that this was not an INES event. The second one related to the sodium fire in PFR.

Steven Heddle noted that DSRL had a milestone for the shipment of fuel to Sellafield. Simon Middlemas confirmed that this was for the DFR breeder fuel movements. Steven Heddle asked how many shipments were expected. Simon Middlemas responded that there would be about 90 shipments in total and would consist of 1 flask per shipment. [Secretary's note – this has been corrected since discussion at the meeting]. Steven Heddle noted that he was delighted to see that this would be going by rail and not sea. Rick Nickerson noted that Shetland Islands Council was opposed to all transport of radioactive material.

The ONR paper was tabled – DSG(2011)P053 refers. Peter Dickenson reported the following:

- ONR had published a strategy document for consultation which would close on 17th November. He encouraged members to respond with views.
- The Nuclear Transport personnel have now joined with ONR. There are early signs that the combination of the different groups into one entity will be of benefit.

The SEPA paper was tabled – DSG(2011)P055 refers. Roger Wilson reported the following:

- SEPA had issued a variation to add CAR compliant conditions and limits to DSRL in October with an effective date of 9th November 2011.
- Two SEPA representatives had visited Buldoo residents to help explain the consultation document which relates to the deposition of rock being dug out from the vaults to protect the environment.
- The RIFE (Radioactivity in Food and the Environment) report had been published. More detail would be provided in the next SEPA report.

Paul Dale noted that the RIFE report confirmed that doses lower than last year although there remained a contribution from Caesium in game which he expected to continue.

Particles update: Phil Cartwright provided a verbal update. Of note:

- Sandside beach continued to be monitored on a regular basis. Since the last meeting 6 particles had been detected and retrieved (1 relevant and 5 minor) and averaged 2 particles per month. Since monitoring had re-started (October 2010) there had now been a full year of data collected from normal and enhanced monitoring. Since then 48 particles in total had been detected and retrieved with the activity averaging the lower end of the minor particles.
- One relevant particle had been detected and retrieved from the Dounreay foreshore.
- Information from the season's off-shore work had been provided to PRAG(D) in August. In total there had been 400 contacts, with 352 particles retrieved. Of the remainder, 29 were mobile contacts, 2 anomalous and 17 particles not retrieved. All information was provided to PRAG(D) and the information was well received. PRAG(D) estimates the detection efficiency to be greater than 90%.
- Since the last meeting DSRL had been carrying out modelling work to try and identify how to arrive at some sort of completion of the project. This will be discussed early next year with PRAG(D). (Post meeting note, a meeting has been arranged to take place in December)

Rick Nickerson confirmed that a response to the Shetland Islands Council letter regarding particles had been received and he had no further questions to raise.

8.

NDA monthly updates for September (DSG(2011)C24) and October (DSG(2011)C252) were noted. Stuart Chalmers provided the following update:

- No current update on the recruitment of a new Chief Executive following Tony Fountain's resignation.
- Mark Lesinski, NDA executive director for delivery, had visited Caithness on the 24th October to launch the Caithness and North Sutherland Fund (CNS Fund).
- Confirmed Simon Middlemas' statement that the NDA Executive was likely to approve the business case for DFR breeder fuel.

Bob Earnshaw noted that DSG had not yet received a response to their submission on DFR Breeder Fuel. Rick Nickerson said he was not aware of a response to Shetland Islands Council. [Secretary's note: NDA's response to stakeholder views was received on 14th November and confirmation of the approved business case was received on 21st November.]

John Deighan asked how the representatives had been selected for the National Stakeholder Group due to meet in November. He was especially interested in the official union representatives.

9.

George Farlow noted that this issue had been deferred from the previous meeting. He reminded members that the COMARE 14th report had been published which had been circulated to all members. In parallel a further paper had been published from Germany – Epidemiological Study on Childhood Cancer in the Vicinity of Nuclear Plants (KIKK-Study).

On 12th July Shetland Islands Council had written to DSG providing a critique of the recent COMARE report and a brief outline of some of the critical responses it had received.

COMARE had subsequently responded that they were aware of a number of comments on the 14th report. Many of the issues raised are already addressed in the report itself. The scientific issues were discussed at COMARE's meeting on 20th July 2011 and it was agreed that a response would be provided on the COMARE website in due course. The committee's overall view was that it did not believe that any of the comments justified changes to the report's conclusions and recommendations.

Alex Elliott noted that COMARE had waited for two months following publication to receive comments before providing a response.

The COMARE report had been written closely with KIKK report and information had been exchanged between the two organisations. A response from COMARE was available on the website – see <http://www.comare.org.uk/documents/COMARE14responsetoreceivedcomments.pdf>

From the COMARE recommendations it was stated that they could not say there is no link however it can be said that the links are extremely small.

There has been another couple of reports published from around the world and COMARE is recommending to Government to look at non-radiological reasons. In COMARE 14th report one of the sites considered which gave a positive result was a phantom nuclear site which would lead to the question of whether there is something else that needs considered. Recommendation 2 is to look at non-radiological effects. It is believed that both the French and German Governments were also taking this stance.

In terms of Dounreay itself the 14th report did not cover Sellafield or Dounreay. The reason is that Dounreay does not have a power plant. Sellafield has Calder Hall but emissions were dwarfed by the Sellafield reprocessing plant. COMARE has to consider the site as a whole. There is a sub group beginning to sketch out COMARE 15 which will include Sellafield and Dounreay research broadening the length of study.

This is expected to be published by the end of next year, assuming the research is on schedule. Part of this research will be looking at this in Sellafield's schools cohort so that COMARE can back this up and compare and contrast data. No data like this exists for Dounreay.

John Deighan noted that past studies indicated that there may be a link due to the movement of people.

Alex Elliott noted that in COMARE 11 there was wide spread data linked to nuclear sites. COMARE had looked at whole of UK and leukaemia clusters were found in all sorts of places. COMARE 11 had attempted to correlate between areas and instances of leukaemia in the under 5 year olds. It appeared that where there was less over-crowding there was more chance of clusters. It then became very difficult to interpret power plant data.

Anne Chard noted that various Governments were looking at others reasons for these clusters. She asked if there had been other studies or plans looking at alternative scenarios which were as robust as those carried out near nuclear plants.

Alex Elliott responded that the Gardiner report had covered some of these issues, including farmers, steelworkers, etc and acknowledged there may well be other factors which came into play.

Rick Nickerson said he would like to thank Alex Elliott for his time and explanation. He noted that this was a controversial area and as a lay-person representing the lay civil society Shetland Islands Council find it strange that eminent scientists from different countries have differing views. Our scientists have taken a different view from the Germans making it difficult for lay people to know who to believe. It was confusing when scientists took completely different views which may change policy. In the light of the KIKK report, German Government was phasing out nuclear power. In the UK because of the COMARE report there is a suspicion that COMARE, as a body, has been influenced by the new build programme.

Rick went on to ask Alex Elliott whether 1:22 is still a considerable increase. Alex Elliott responded that it was not statistically significant. Further he noted that he could not fundamentally agree that there was a disagreement between the UK and Germany in the context that had been discussed. COMARE has no locus for new build and Alex refuted any imbalance in the report.

Rick Nickerson stated that it was interesting, in terms of the small number issues, that a spike after Chernobyl and childhood leukaemia had lasted for 2 to 3 years and then returned to a normal profile. Alex Elliott responded that the Health Board numbers were too small to associate with Chernobyl. Scientifically it could not be said that it was related.

Rick stated he believed there was a short term rise in Childhood leukaemia in Shetland after Chernobyl

Paul Dale noted that the fallout of Chernobyl showed greater concentrations in SW Scotland and Cumbria. If there had been such a link in Shetland, he would have expected this to be similar throughout the UK and not confined to Shetland. He noted that sometime circumstantial evidence is not the cause.

Alastair MacDonald stated that it appeared that most of the targeted data was gathered from the nuclear industry and did not look further than that. It appeared now that scientists were beginning to look at other areas and industries. Alex Elliott acknowledged that the research needed to be widened.

10.

George Farlow noted that there were three papers for discussion.

- DSG(2011)C249 – a proposal for a review of the DSG. This had been circulated to members by correspondence and responses had been supportive. The Socio Economic sub group meeting had endorsed the proposal.

George Farlow noted that the idea of the review was to allow DSG members to take a step back and make sure the group was focussing on the things that really mattered.

Steven Heddle asked who the stakeholders were. The secretary responded that the review would include all DSG members and observers and others as identified, ie Scottish Government.

The proposal was endorsed.

- DSG(2011)C250 – Protocol for information requests and website publishing.

Members discussed the draft document. Rick Nickerson stated that he was fairly comfortable with the protocol as long as it did not stifle discussions. The document was agreed by members.

Rick Nickerson asked whether the ratification of the minutes could be speeded up. It was agreed that the Secretary would issue the draft minutes within 10 working days of the meeting, requesting comments be provided by email (without 10 working days). Following the deadline for comments it would be taken that the minutes were acceptable and published on the website (within 20 working days of the meeting).

- DSG(2011)C245 – ONR's consultation on bulk quantities waste.

In respect of licensing of sites, a question was raised as to SEPA's role within the Radioactive Substances Act. Paul Dale noted that the bulk quantities consultation was looking to discuss strategy. If there was no intention to retrieve waste then it would be disposal. There are some exemptions within the consultation, eg smoke detectors, sealed sources. Roger Wilson added that non-nuclear sites was SEPA's responsibility.

It was noted that ONR's consultation closes on 12th December and responses were invited. The Secretary agreed to circulate a draft response to the consultation for comments by members.

David Flear and June Love had attended the ONR workshop which had been held on the 24th October. At the workshop ONR explained that the nuclear site licensing regime currently applies to a set of defined activities which include the of bulk quantities of radioactive matter. However, there is no clear definition of what constitutes 'bulk quantities' of radioactive matter, storage of which would need to be licensed.

On nuclear licensed sites, SEPA authorises disposals (for solid wastes, defined as emplacement with no intention to retrieve which ONR regulates storage. On other sites (non-licensed) SEPA regulates both disposal and accumulation (ie, storage) of waste.

Separately, Government (Department of Energy and Climate Change, DECC) has started work on the implementation of the 2004 protocol to the Paris Convention. This will address bringing of radioactive material into the nuclear site liability regime.

Until DECC is in a position to give clarification on the implementation of the Paris Convention, ONR will interpret 'bulk quantities', with respect to storage as a quantity of radioactive material exceeding one hundred times the levels set out in Schedule 2 of Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2001 (REPPPIR). Notes from the workshop are available – DSG(2011)C258 refers.

11.

- DSG(2011)C255 – Shetland Islands Council letter to SEPA regarding Shipments of Radioactive Materials.

Rick Nickerson noted that Shetland Islands Council had written to SEPA raising concerns at the proposed shipment of radioactive materials to Belgium and other similar proposals.

- Remediation of Radioactively Contaminated Sites

Rick Nickerson noted that a letter had been sent to the Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and the Environment and also to SEPA's chairman. [Secretary's note: copies of the letters arrived on the 2nd November and therefore there had not been time to circulate – the letters would be scanned, referenced and published on the website for information.]

Rick stated that Shetland Islands Council had concerns that SEPA has adopted a major change in its policy towards the remediation of radioactive contaminated sites in Scotland without a full consultation involving stakeholders and the public.

Paul Dale responded that SEPA would be responding to Shetland Islands Council's letter. The policy was consistent with the radioactive contaminated land regulations 2007 (Scotland) and associated EC and IAEA basic safety standards. The policy is also consistent with advice from the Dounreay Particles Advisory Group and PRAG(D) to SEPA. The legislation states where more detriment than good can be done to remediate a site. The SEPA Board has been consistent in its approach to radioactive contaminated land and there is no change in SEPA's policy for addressing this. While there may be perception is that there has been a change, this was not the case.

- Emergency Services exercise

The secretary noted that the emergency services exercise which was planned for the 25th August and subsequently postponed would now take place on 20th November at around 1300 hrs). The exercise will include personnel from DSRL's health physics, Northern Constabulary, Highlands and Islands Fire & Rescue and the Scottish Ambulance Service as well as those who will be observing the exercise. The area, at the old visitors centre, will be used to set up a simulation of a road traffic accident

involving a vehicle carrying (notionally) radioactive materials.

- Scottish Sites meeting, 26th October 2011

DSG(2011)C257 provides a summary report of the Scottish Sites meeting.

- Graham Construction – recruitment

John Deighan noted that he welcomed the recent media coverage stating the Graham Construction were looking to recruit locally. He asked how many local people had been recruited.

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

DSG Site Restoration Sub Group chairman
5th November 2011

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A001: Secretary to put Action M007/A043 on agenda for business meeting to agree how to take this forward.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A002: SRSG members to email secretary with any questions relating to Rolls Royce and the announcement on the future of Vulcan.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A003: Secretary to put future of Vulcan site on DSG business meeting to discuss a way forward in addressing questions relating to Rolls Royce.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A004: Secretary to circulate ONR strategy consultation document to SRSG members for comment.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A005: Secretary to check with the NDA Stakeholder Manager on union representation at the National Stakeholder Group meeting due to be held in November.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A006: Secretary to ensure that minutes of sub group meeting is published on the website within 20 working days of the meeting.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A007: Secretary to circulate draft response on ONR's consultation on bulk quantities waste for comment.

DSG/SRSG(2011)M006/A008: Secretary to write to Graham Construction to ask how many local people have been recruited so far and how many were expected to be employed throughout the duration of the low level waste project.

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

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.

DSG(2011)M007/A001: Secretary to amend minutes to reflect comment from Cllr Rick Nickerson.

DSG(2011)M007/A002: Secretary to put draft DSG protocol on sub group agenda for November meetings.

DSG(2011)M007/A003: Secretary to put draft review of DSG on sub group agenda for November meetings.

DSG(2011)M007/A004: Secretary to circulate possible dates for special low level waste meeting.

DSG(2011)M007/A005: Secretary to write to Highland Council planning stressing the importance of attending DSG meetings.

DSG(2011)M007/A010: DSRL to address all issues raised on low level waste from the site restoration sub group meeting held in April.

DSG(2011)M007/A011: DSG to write to Highland Council seeking clarification as to whether the trial blast requested by DSRL requires planning permission.

DSG(2011)M007/A012: DSG to write to NDA to ask for clarification on how they will fill funding gap after completion of all assets are sold. **Action complete**

Assets sales only provide a minor part of the funding for the NDA. The main sources of funding are commercial income and government grant. Asset sales are part of the NDA's plan of business optimisation to maximise revenue from any surplus assets to provide revenue for decommissioning. The overall funding of the NDA will not be significantly impacted when all available surplus assets are sold.

DSG(2011)M007/A013: Caithness Chamber of Commerce to circulate DSRL's draft paper on socio economic criteria in contracts for input from members.

DSG(2011)M007/A015: George Farlow to discuss issues with Highland Council Planning on low level waste construction to provide clarity of the current situation. Action complete – this item was raised at the Planning, Environment and Development Committee on the 3rd August 2011 under item 9 of the agenda.

DSG(2011)M007/A016: Audrey Cooper to provide Highland Council Planning conditions for low level waste project.

DSG(2011)M007/A017: Audrey Cooper to consider a public document to describe the difference between excavation and blasting for the low level waste facility.

DSG(2011)M007/A018: Members of DSG Site Restoration Sub Group to provide comment to the Secretary on DSG(2011)C221 – Draft event disclosure policy, by the 5th August 2011.

DSG(2011)M007/A019: Secretary to circulate NDA presentations to Site Stakeholder Group Chair's forum to all DSG members.

DSG(2011)M007/A020: Secretary to invite a representative from COMARE to the November Site Restoration sub group meeting.

DSG(2011)M007/A021: Secretary to put COMARE/KIKK report on agenda for November Site Restoration sub group meeting.

DSG(2011)M007/A022: 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 19th August 2011.

DSG(2011)M007/A033: Anna MacConnell to identify date when Direct Rail Services would meet with Caithness Transport Forum to rail transportation. Action complete -

DSG(2011)M007/A034: Secretary to write to Anna MacConnell requesting information on the difference of costs in terms of total lifetime costs for all credible options

DSG(2011)M007/A042: Linda Buchan, SEPA to confirm whether SEPA had been consulted on the shipment of radioactive steam generators from Canada to Sweden.

DSG(2011)M007/A043: ONR to provide a response as to whether risk assessments for nuclear shipments consider the removal of the emergency tug vessels. Action complete – Email from Peter Dickenson on 10th October 2011 as follows “It is my understanding that risk assessments for shipments are not a matter for ONR. However, my transport colleagues have taken the matter up with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCGA), who replied to the question as follows: Risk assessments for shipments are for the consignor of the cargo. The ETV [emergency tug vessels] service has been withdrawn and although we [MCGA] are involved in the efforts to fund and provide a short term service in Scotland post-withdrawal we cannot comment on the impact of these arrangements until the contractual arrangements have been completed.”