



5<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C013

[Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot](mailto:Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot)

Roseanna Cunningham, MSP  
Scottish Government  
T3.07  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP

Dear Madam

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017, DSG along with other stakeholders had the opportunity to meet with you at the Scottish Government Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and were invited to provide one question relating to our area. The DSG raised two questions given that both Dounreay and Vulcan are included within our stakeholder engagement.

The Vulcan question raised was "The DSG has continued, over the past few years, to question the Ministry of Defence about their plans to include community views on the options for the future of Vulcan site. Responses to date have not been completely positive and there are concerns that an option will be agreed without any community input. Can Scottish Government support the need for community involvement in this decision making process?"

At a DSG sub group meeting held in January 2019 we were surprised to find that, after two years of promises to provide us with a list of options for the site, MOD would not allow any sharing of the information provided, which to be frank was scant at best and having asked for a presentation at our March public meeting, we were informed with two days notification, that this would not be happening.

**Please respond to:**

**June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**

**Fax: 01847 893459**

**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

I attach copies of letters which have been sent to others which provide more of the background of our disappointment at MOD's treatment of the DSG.

I am writing to you to ask what, progress you have made in discussions with MoD to our original question posted to you in 2017. Whilst we realise this is not a devolved matter, the economic well-being of our area post-Vulcan certainly is and we would ask you to ensure MoD do not simply retreat from this area leaving behind a legacy that provides no benefit to anyone either in the short or long term.

We look forward to hearing the outcome of any discussions you held following the questions raised by us at in 2017.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

cc. Rt Hon Gavin Williamson, MP  
Commodore Mark Adams  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&Is list MSPs  
CEO, Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste Team  
DSG Secretariat



Please respond to:

June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ

Tel: 01847 890886

Fax: 01847 893459

Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)

---

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

)

)

)

)

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

**Enc: Copy of letter to Commodore Mark Adams**



9<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C012

[ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk](mailto:ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk)

Commodore Mark Adams  
MoD Abbey Wood  
Bristol  
BS34 8JH

**Please respond to:**

**June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**

**Fax: 01847 893459**

**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

Dear Commodore Adams

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

As chairman of the Dounreay Stakeholder Group, I am writing on behalf of the membership to convey our outrage at the way in which MOD have dealt with their decision making on the future options for the Vulcan site.

) In 2011 the Secretary of State made an announcement that there would be no requirement for testing of the next generation of naval reactors.

) In 2015, the Vulcan site ceased operations and informed the DSG that they would be concentrating on defueling the reactors, moving into decommissioning in 2023.

Since then we have asked MOD Vulcan to consider providing an opportunity for community views on the various options for the future of the site. While MOD has made it clear, in that they inform DSG members, they do not have a statutory obligation to consult with the community. DSG has reminded them that given the community support over the last 50 years they at the very least had a moral obligation to listen to community views.

Two years ago, MOD promised to come to the DSG Site Restoration Sub group and outline potential options for the site. You can imagine our outrage and disappointment when we were informed at the meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019 that:

- J MOD were only at the stage of appraising options
- J Informed DSG that the presentation could not be shared in minutes or on the website as it would prejudice procurement going forward
- J Informed that MOD would not consult and that the preferred option going forward would be subject to the planning process which does involve consultation.

At that meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019, we challenged the MOD representative to come up with a suitable presentation for the public DSG meeting (held on 13<sup>th</sup> March) which would not prejudice procurement activities. We believed that those driving this forward were suitably intelligent enough to be able to provide this and therefore you can imagine our surprise when two days' before the meeting, having had to chase for a response, we were told that no such presentation would be forthcoming. Indeed the MOD representative called off from attending the meeting with an hour to go and while this was indicated as due to illness it was with some surprise that she asked, at very short notice, Commander Shaun Southwood to step in which we thought was extremely unfair.

MOD has been part of the DSG since 2005 and also involved in previous liaison groups prior to that date. When DSG was set up, it was clearly a different regime than that of the previous liaison groups and while we appreciate that the relationship between DSG and NDA/Dounreay and DSG and MOD are slightly different we are not impressed by the way in which MOD continues to hide behind this cloak of secrecy. While you can argue that the site still has a security feature given the fuel remaining on the site, the same can be said of Dounreay and DSRL simply state they cannot discuss matters of security. This does not negate the fact they are entirely open and honest in all other aspects. In addition the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority ran a competition of the management of the Dounreay site and was able to keep DSG informed as this progressed – this in no way prejudiced any procurement going forward.

It would appear that MOD cannot learn lessons of the past. On the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014, the then DSG Chairman receive a letter from Commodore Corderoy in response to MOD informing us that there had been a leak on site, **2 years** after this incident had happened. The letter from Commodore Corderoy stated ““The Dounreay Stakeholder Group has been an important means for us to communicate with the local community and I continue to value the trust and dialogue that exists between us. I realise that the effectiveness of the relationship relies on your Group’s trust in MoD and on MoD being as open as we can be. I wish to provide you with my personal assurance that we have been and will continue to be open on site issues, subject only to the very real and necessary constraints of National Security. Notwithstanding this, the safety of the site, any effects on the local community and safety of all persons remain my top priority.”

It would appear that MOD has still not grasped the fact that trust works both ways and the fact that after a wait of two years with a promise that the site options would be discussed it appears that they are no-where close to be agreed. From a community point of view this is very disappointing and raises questions on value to the tax-payer if you have not even reached a point of appraising these options.

While we imagine that we are not going to be consulted until a preferred option is selected and goes to planning we would like to make it clear again – to avoid any doubt and confusion, that DSG want to see:

- J the Vulcan site fully decommissioned in line with the Dounreay site unless MOD have some other economic use for the site.
- J a socio economic impact assessment at the options appraisal stage to ensure this is part of the consideration of the options going forward, and
- J whatever option is taken forward there should be a socio economic clause within the contract for future decommissioning.

I must at this stage caveat this with the fact that Cdr Shaun Southwood (and his predecessor Cdr Ken Dyke) are as open and honest as they could be with DSG in regards the operational side of reporting and this letter is in no way a complaint regarding their contributions.

To close, trust works both ways and we are bitterly disappointed that MOD appears to be providing lip-service to the DSG. Unless you can build back the trust (again) DSG will have to consider its involvement in engaging with MOD in the future.

We look forward to a response which will hopefully provide us with some comfort someone is listening to us and that sense can prevail.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

**Copied to:**

Rt Hon Gavin Williamson  
Roseanna Cunningham, Scottish Government  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste team  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&I List MSPs  
CEO Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
DSG Secretariat



5<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C013

[Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot](mailto:Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot)

Roseanna Cunningham, MSP  
Scottish Government  
T3.07  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP

Dear Madam

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017, DSG along with other stakeholders had the opportunity to meet with you at the Scottish Government Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and were invited to provide one question relating to our area. The DSG raised two questions given that both Dounreay and Vulcan are included within our stakeholder engagement.

The Vulcan question raised was "The DSG has continued, over the past few years, to question the Ministry of Defence about their plans to include community views on the options for the future of Vulcan site. Responses to date have not been completely positive and there are concerns that an option will be agreed without any community input. Can Scottish Government support the need for community involvement in this decision making process?"

At a DSG sub group meeting held in January 2019 we were surprised to find that, after two years of promises to provide us with a list of options for the site, MOD would not allow any sharing of the information provided, which to be frank was scant at best and having asked for a presentation at our March public meeting, we were informed with two days notification, that this would not be happening.

**Please respond to:**

**June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**

**Fax: 01847 893459**

**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**



I attach copies of letters which have been sent to others which provide more of the background of our disappointment at MOD's treatment of the DSG.

I am writing to you to ask what, progress you have made in discussions with MoD to our original question posted to you in 2017. Whilst we realise this is not a devolved matter, the economic well-being of our area post-Vulcan certainly is and we would ask you to ensure MoD do not simply retreat from this area leaving behind a legacy that provides no benefit to anyone either in the short or long term.

We look forward to hearing the outcome of any discussions you held following the questions raised by us at in 2017.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

cc. Rt Hon Gavin Williamson, MP  
Commodore Mark Adams  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&Is list MSPs  
CEO, Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste Team  
DSG Secretariat



9<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C012

[ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk](mailto:ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk)

Commodore Mark Adams  
MoD Abbey Wood  
Bristol  
BS34 8JH

**Please respond to:**

**June Love**  
**DSG Secretariat**  
**Dounreay.com**  
**Traill House**  
**7 Orlig Street**  
**Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**  
**Fax: 01847 893459**  
**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

Dear Commodore Adams

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP**  
**MOD VULAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

As chairman of the Dounreay Stakeholder Group, I am writing on behalf of the membership to convey our outrage at the way in which MOD have dealt with their decision making on the future options for the Vulcan site.

- J In 2011 the Secretary of State made an announcement that there would be no requirement for testing of the next generation of naval reactors.
- J In 2015, the Vulcan site ceased operations and informed the DSG that they would be concentrating on defueling the reactors, moving into decommissioning in 2023.

Since then we have asked MOD Vulcan to consider providing an opportunity for community views on the various options for the future of the site. While MOD has made it clear, in that they inform DSG members, they do not have a statutory obligation to consult with the community. DSG has reminded them that given the community support over the last 50 years they at the very least had a moral obligation to listen to community views.

Two years ago, MOD promised to come to the DSG Site Restoration Sub group and outline potential options for the site. You can imagine our outrage and disappointment when we were informed at the meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019 that:

- J MOD were only at the stage of appraising options
- J Informed DSG that the presentation could not be shared in minutes or on the website as it would prejudice procurement going forward
- J Informed that MOD would not consult and that the preferred option going forward would be subject to the planning process which does involve consultation.

At that meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019, we challenged the MOD representative to come up with a suitable presentation for the public DSG meeting (held on 13<sup>th</sup> March) which would not prejudice procurement activities. We believed that those driving this forward were suitably intelligent enough to be able to provide this and therefore you can imagine our surprise when two days' before the meeting, having had to chase for a response, we were told that no such presentation would be forthcoming. Indeed the MOD representative called off from attending the meeting with an hour to go and while this was indicated as due to illness it was with some surprise that she asked, at very short notice, Commander Shaun Southwood to step in which we thought was extremely unfair.

MOD has been part of the DSG since 2005 and also involved in previous liaison groups prior to that date. When DSG was set up, it was clearly a different regime than that of the previous liaison groups and while we appreciate that the relationship between DSG and NDA/Dounreay and DSG and MOD are slightly different we are not impressed by the way in which MOD continues to hide behind this cloak of secrecy. While you can argue that the site still has a security feature given the fuel remaining on the site, the same can be said of Dounreay and DSRL simply state they cannot discuss matters of security. This does not negate the fact they are entirely open and honest in all other aspects. In addition the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority ran a competition of the management of the Dounreay site and was able to keep DSG informed as this progressed – this in no way prejudiced any procurement going forward.

It would appear that MOD cannot learn lessons of the past. On the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014, the then DSG Chairman receive a letter from Commodore Corderoy in response to MOD informing us that there had been a leak on site, **2 years** after this incident had happened. The letter from Commodore Corderoy stated ““The Dounreay Stakeholder Group has been an important means for us to communicate with the local community and I continue to value the trust and dialogue that exists between us. I realise that the effectiveness of the relationship relies on your Group’s trust in MoD and on MoD being as open as we can be. I wish to provide you with my personal assurance that we have been and will continue to be open on site issues, subject only to the very real and necessary constraints of National Security. Notwithstanding this, the safety of the site, any effects on the local community and safety of all persons remain my top priority.”

It would appear that MOD has still not grasped the fact that trust works both ways and the fact that after a wait of two years with a promise that the site options would be discussed it appears that they are no-where close to be agreed. From a community point of view this is very disappointing and raises questions on value to the tax-payer if you have not even reached a point of appraising these options.

While we imagine that we are not going to be consulted until a preferred option is selected and goes to planning we would like to make it clear again – to avoid any doubt and confusion, that DSG want to see:

- J the Vulcan site fully decommissioned in line with the Dounreay site unless MOD have some other economic use for the site.
- J a socio economic impact assessment at the options appraisal stage to ensure this is part of the consideration of the options going forward, and
- J whatever option is taken forward there should be a socio economic clause within the contract for future decommissioning.

I must at this stage caveat this with the fact that Cdr Shaun Southwood (and his predecessor Cdr Ken Dyke) are as open and honest as they could be with DSG in regards the operational side of reporting and this letter is in no way a complaint regarding their contributions.

To close, trust works both ways and we are bitterly disappointed that MOD appears to be providing lip-service to the DSG. Unless you can build back the trust (again) DSG will have to consider its involvement in engaging with MOD in the future.

We look forward to a response which will hopefully provide us with some comfort someone is listening to us and that sense can prevail.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

**Copied to:**

Rt Hon Gavin Williamson  
Roseanna Cunningham, Scottish Government  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste team  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&I List MSPs  
CEO Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
DSG Secretariat



Please respond to:

June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ

Tel: 01847 890886

Fax: 01847 893459

Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)

---

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

)

)

)

)

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

**Enc: Copy of letter to Commodore Mark Adams**



9<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C012

[ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk](mailto:ESSMNP-HDNNPI@mod.uk)

Commodore Mark Adams  
MoD Abbey Wood  
Bristol  
BS34 8JH

**Please respond to:**

**June Love**  
**DSG Secretariat**  
**Dounreay.com**  
**Traill House**  
**7 Orlig Street**  
**Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**  
**Fax: 01847 893459**  
**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

Dear Commodore Adams

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP**  
**MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

As chairman of the Dounreay Stakeholder Group, I am writing on behalf of the membership to convey our outrage at the way in which MOD have dealt with their decision making on the future options for the Vulcan site.

- J In 2011 the Secretary of State made an announcement that there would be no requirement for testing of the next generation of naval reactors.
- J In 2015, the Vulcan site ceased operations and informed the DSG that they would be concentrating on defueling the reactors, moving into decommissioning in 2023.

Since then we have asked MOD Vulcan to consider providing an opportunity for community views on the various options for the future of the site. While MOD has made it clear, in that they inform DSG members, they do not have a statutory obligation to consult with the community. DSG has reminded them that given the community support over the last 50 years they at the very least had a moral obligation to listen to community views.

Two years ago, MOD promised to come to the DSG Site Restoration Sub group and outline potential options for the site. You can imagine our outrage and disappointment when we were informed at the meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019 that:

- J MOD were only at the stage of appraising options
- J Informed DSG that the presentation could not be shared in minutes or on the website as it would prejudice procurement going forward
- J Informed that MOD would not consult and that the preferred option going forward would be subject to the planning process which does involve consultation.

At that meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> January 2019, we challenged the MOD representative to come up with a suitable presentation for the public DSG meeting (held on 13<sup>th</sup> March) which would not prejudice procurement activities. We believed that those driving this forward were suitably intelligent enough to be able to provide this and therefore you can imagine our surprise when two days' before the meeting, having had to chase for a response, we were told that no such presentation would be forthcoming. Indeed the MOD representative called off from attending the meeting with an hour to go and while this was indicated as due to illness it was with some surprise that she asked, at very short notice, Commander Shaun Southwood to step in which we thought was extremely unfair.

MOD has been part of the DSG since 2005 and also involved in previous liaison groups prior to that date. When DSG was set up, it was clearly a different regime than that of the previous liaison groups and while we appreciate that the relationship between DSG and NDA/Dounreay and DSG and MOD are slightly different we are not impressed by the way in which MOD continues to hide behind this cloak of secrecy. While you can argue that the site still has a security feature given the fuel remaining on the site, the same can be said of Dounreay and DSRL simply state they cannot discuss matters of security. This does not negate the fact they are entirely open and honest in all other aspects. In addition the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority ran a competition of the management of the Dounreay site and was able to keep DSG informed as this progressed – this in no way prejudiced any procurement going forward.

It would appear that MOD cannot learn lessons of the past. On the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2014, the then DSG Chairman receive a letter from Commodore Corderoy in response to MOD informing us that there had been a leak on site, **2 years** after this incident had happened. The letter from Commodore Corderoy stated ““The Dounreay Stakeholder Group has been an important means for us to communicate with the local community and I continue to value the trust and dialogue that exists between us. I realise that the effectiveness of the relationship relies on your Group’s trust in MoD and on MoD being as open as we can be. I wish to provide you with my personal assurance that we have been and will continue to be open on site issues, subject only to the very real and necessary constraints of National Security. Notwithstanding this, the safety of the site, any effects on the local community and safety of all persons remain my top priority.”

It would appear that MOD has still not grasped the fact that trust works both ways and the fact that after a wait of two years with a promise that the site options would be discussed it appears that they are no-where close to be agreed. From a community point of view this is very disappointing and raises questions on value to the tax-payer if you have not even reached a point of appraising these options.



While we imagine that we are not going to be consulted until a preferred option is selected and goes to planning we would like to make it clear again – to avoid any doubt and confusion, that DSG want to see:

- J the Vulcan site fully decommissioned in line with the Dounreay site unless MOD have some other economic use for the site.
- J a socio economic impact assessment at the options appraisal stage to ensure this is part of the consideration of the options going forward, and
- J whatever option is taken forward there should be a socio economic clause within the contract for future decommissioning.

I must at this stage caveat this with the fact that Cdr Shaun Southwood (and his predecessor Cdr Ken Dyke) are as open and honest as they could be with DSG in regards the operational side of reporting and this letter is in no way a complaint regarding their contributions.

To close, trust works both ways and we are bitterly disappointed that MOD appears to be providing lip-service to the DSG. Unless you can build back the trust (again) DSG will have to consider its involvement in engaging with MOD in the future.

We look forward to a response which will hopefully provide us with some comfort someone is listening to us and that sense can prevail.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

**Copied to:**

Rt Hon Gavin Williamson  
Roseanna Cunningham, Scottish Government  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste team  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&I List MSPs  
CEO Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
DSG Secretariat



5<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C013

[Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot](mailto:Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot)

Roseanna Cunningham, MSP  
Scottish Government  
T3.07  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP

Dear Madam

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017, DSG along with other stakeholders had the opportunity to meet with you at the Scottish Government Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and were invited to provide one question relating to our area. The DSG raised two questions given that both Dounreay and Vulcan are included within our stakeholder engagement.

The Vulcan question raised was "The DSG has continued, over the past few years, to question the Ministry of Defence about their plans to include community views on the options for the future of Vulcan site. Responses to date have not been completely positive and there are concerns that an option will be agreed without any community input. Can Scottish Government support the need for community involvement in this decision making process?"

At a DSG sub group meeting held in January 2019 we were surprised to find that, after two years of promises to provide us with a list of options for the site, MOD would not allow any sharing of the information provided, which to be frank was scant at best and having asked for a presentation at our March public meeting, we were informed with two days notification, that this would not be happening.

**Please respond to:**

**June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**

**Fax: 01847 893459**

**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

I attach copies of letters which have been sent to others which provide more of the background of our disappointment at MOD's treatment of the DSG.

I am writing to you to ask what, progress you have made in discussions with MoD to our original question posted to you in 2017. Whilst we realise this is not a devolved matter, the economic well-being of our area post-Vulcan certainly is and we would ask you to ensure MoD do not simply retreat from this area leaving behind a legacy that provides no benefit to anyone either in the short or long term.

We look forward to hearing the outcome of any discussions you held following the questions raised by us at in 2017.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

cc. Rt Hon Gavin Williamson, MP  
Commodore Mark Adams  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&Is list MSPs  
CEO, Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste Team  
DSG Secretariat



5<sup>th</sup> April 2019  
Ref: DSG(2019)C013

[Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot](mailto:Roseanna.Cunningham.msp@parliament.scot)

Roseanna Cunningham, MSP  
Scottish Government  
T3.07  
The Scottish Parliament  
Edinburgh  
EH99 1SP

Dear Madam

**DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
MOD VULCAN SITE**

The Dounreay Stakeholder Group (DSG) is represented by over 20 organisations and therefore this response is one that is generally agreed by most organisations.

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017, DSG along with other stakeholders had the opportunity to meet with you at the Scottish Government Scottish Nuclear Sites meeting and were invited to provide one question relating to our area. The DSG raised two questions given that both Dounreay and Vulcan are included within our stakeholder engagement.

The Vulcan question raised was "The DSG has continued, over the past few years, to question the Ministry of Defence about their plans to include community views on the options for the future of Vulcan site. Responses to date have not been completely positive and there are concerns that an option will be agreed without any community input. Can Scottish Government support the need for community involvement in this decision making process?"

At a DSG sub group meeting held in January 2019 we were surprised to find that, after two years of promises to provide us with a list of options for the site, MOD would not allow any sharing of the information provided, which to be frank was scant at best and having asked for a presentation at our March public meeting, we were informed with two days notification, that this would not be happening.

**Please respond to:**

**June Love  
DSG Secretariat  
Dounreay.com  
Traill House  
7 Orlig Street  
Thurso, Caithness, KW14 7BJ**

**Tel: 01847 890886**

**Fax: 01847 893459**

**Email: [info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org](mailto:info@dounreaystakeholdergroup.org)**

I attach copies of letters which have been sent to others which provide more of the background of our disappointment at MOD's treatment of the DSG.

I am writing to you to ask what, progress you have made in discussions with MoD to our original question posted to you in 2017. Whilst we realise this is not a devolved matter, the economic well-being of our area post-Vulcan certainly is and we would ask you to ensure MoD do not simply retreat from this area leaving behind a legacy that provides no benefit to anyone either in the short or long term.

We look forward to hearing the outcome of any discussions you held following the questions raised by us at in 2017.

Yours sincerely

*Sent electronically without signature*

**Roger Saxon**  
**DSG Chairman**

cc. Rt Hon Gavin Williamson, MP  
Commodore Mark Adams  
Jamie Stone, MP  
Gail Ross, MSP  
H&Is list MSPs  
CEO, Highland Council  
Leader of Highland Council  
Martin MacDonald, Scottish Government Radwaste Team  
DSG Secretariat