



10<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
DSG(2017)C037

MOD Ministerial Correspondence Unit  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Zone A  
Main Building  
Whitehall, London  
SW1A 2HB

Dear Sir/Madam

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations. However, there are some organisations, who may not agree entirely with this submission and therefore these organisations have been encouraged to provide their own response

Thank you for your response to our letter of 11<sup>th</sup> August (ref DSG(2017)C030) about the future of the Vulcan Naval Reactor Test Establishment site.

We remain disappointed with your latest response (dated 5<sup>th</sup> October) and request that you provide some clarity with respect to this letter.

We are surprised that you would particularly welcome the views of the DSG on what they would like to see happen at the site. We have corresponded a number of times with MOD and these include:

- DSG(2012)C043: Future of the MOD Vulcan site (15<sup>th</sup> May 2012).
- DSG(2012)C056: MOD response to C043 (21<sup>st</sup> June 2012)
- DSG(2012)C089: Presentation to DSG on Vulcan site future (12<sup>th</sup> December 2012).
- DSG(2014)C053: DSG and Vulcan MOD Site (PWR reactors) (6<sup>th</sup> August 2014)
- DSG(2015)C027: Update to C053 (25 March 2015)
- DSG(2017)C016: Requirements for MOD to engage/consult with community (19<sup>th</sup> April 2017)
- DSG(2017)C019: Response to C016 (30<sup>th</sup> May 2017)
- DSG(2017)C030: Requirements for MOD to engage/consult with community (11<sup>th</sup> Aug 2017)
- DSG(2017)C034: MOD's response to C030 (5 October 2017).

In addition, there have been a number of discussions, both privately and publicly, stating that as community representatives if there is no future for the Vulcan site then we would like to see the site being fully decommissioned.

DSG was central in the consultation for the Dounreay site when considering the site end state/use. During that consultation it was clear that the end use was so far away that it would be impossible to categorically state what the site should be used for once decommissioning was complete. Therefore we concentrated on the site end state but asking for flexibility to ensure that any economic development that may be identified further down the line was not excluded because of choices made so early in the process.

Your latest letter states that the current assessment of the decommissioning options for Vulcan is dependent on various factors which are yet to be decided. To this end and to satisfy that we are not simply being used as a 'tick box' exercise we would ask for clear answers to the following questions:

- What is the current timeline for option assessment for the future of the Vulcan site? Can you please detail the various steps you require to take before you are ready to make the assessment on the options?
- Are the 'various factors' stated in your letter of 5<sup>th</sup> October factors related to the assessment process of the potential future options or are these factors relating to potential future use of the site by MOD?
  - If this statement relates to the criteria in which you assess the potential options then we would expect that the criteria would follow the standard set of criteria, including (but not exhaustive to) health and safety, environment, technical, cost and socio economics.
- We are aware that the land is owned by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and would like to understand how much involvement NDA have in the decision-making process for the future options.

We believe we have been very clear as to our views on what we would like to see happen to the site but given the latest correspondence received let us make it very clear.

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group would like to see the site fully decommissioned unless MOD intends to use the site for future operations or if any other economic development requires such a site to operate from. We believe it was a sensible option to take the Dounreay site back (as near as possible) to what it was before Dounreay was built so for the sake of clarity we would expect nothing less for the Vulcan site.

We hope now that you understand the views of the DSG, something we have been expressing for a number of years and equally disappointed that you felt it necessary to ask for these views again.

We look forward to receiving a full and factual response to the questions raised and a clear timeline of when you would expect to seek community views.

Yours sincerely

Copies to:

The Rt Hon Gavin Williamson MP (Secretary of State for Defence)

Roseanna Cunningham, Cabinet Secretary for Environment, Climate Change and Land Reform

Charles Stewart-Roper, Scottish Government Radwaste team

Jamie Stone, MP

Gail Ross, MSP

Highland Council, Planning Director

Leader of the Highland Council

Caithness Councillors (via Alex MacManus)