

DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP

SITE RESTORATION SUB-GROUP

Minutes of the DSG Site Restoration sub-group meeting held on Wednesday 27th April 2022 at 1900 hours in the Georgina lounge, Pentland Hotel and via MS Teams.

Present:	Gillian Coghill	DSG Site Restoration sub-group chair (Buldoo Residents Chair)
	Roger Saxon	DSG honorary member
	Thelma Mackenzie	Thurso Community Council
	Niall Watson	Dounreay Unions
	David Broughton	DSG Co-opted Member of the Public

In addition:	Dawn Clasper	DSG Minute Secretary
	June Love	Dounreay Community Relations Manager (DSG Secretariat)
	Frederic Stalin	DSRL Strategic Programme Director
	Cdr Ian Walker	MOD Vulcan
	Ian Rogers	ONR (Dounreay)
	Stewart Ballantine	SEPA
	Vik Winspear-Roberts	ONR (Vulcan)
	Ian Davies	CNC

MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Gillian Coghill welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance.

Gillian Coghill noted that Cllr Willie Mackay had indicated he would be content to stay in the role of deputy chair, however, due to the Council elections not yet being held it was difficult to know if he would remain on the DSG in his capacity as Councillor. She suggested that unless there were any volunteers for the role this could be held over until the July meeting. This was agreed by members.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

- David Craig, Caithness West Community Council
- Fiona Bruce, Women in Nuclear
- Cllr Willie Mackay, Highland Council
- Brian Mutch, Scottish Government Rural Payments & Inspections Directorate
- Tor Justad, DSG Co-opted Member of the Public
- Davie Alexander, DSG Vice-chair
- James Bryson, DNSR
- Cllr Struan Mackie, DSG Chair

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Gillian Coghill noted that the last meeting - DSG/SESG(2021)M04, held in January 2022 – had been circulated in advance to all members. These minutes had been endorsed at the DSG public meeting held in March 2022.

She invited members to raise anything from the minutes.

David Broughton asked if there had been any feedback on his comments re the NDA Business plan not bearing relation to the new Life Time Plan and asked if there had been any feedback from this.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A001: DSG to request feedback with respect to the NDA Business plan not bearing relation to the new Life Time Plan.

Roger Saxon noted a typo on page 6 – ‘states’ should read ‘date’. This was amended following the meeting.

4. ACTION STATUS

Gillian Coghill noted that the status of actions had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Of note:

- DSG(2022)M01/A017: DSG business group to consider membership of a new working group to focus on Vulcan decommissioning options and the joining of Dounreay/Magnox. **Action ongoing:** discussed, draft remit and membership provided, awaiting response from the Vulcan Project team.

June Love noted that the membership has been confirmed as DSG Chair, subgroup chairs, DSRL Unions, CNSRP, Caithness Chamber of Commerce and Jamie Stone as our MP. The first meeting will finalise the remit of the working group and this would then be circulated to DSG members.

- DSG(2021)M04/A001: DSRL to provide an update on the FIDLER (related to particle monitoring) at the next site restoration sub-group. **Action ongoing:** Information provided as part of DSG site restoration paper update (DSG(2021)P003). Will continue to be updated via site restoration sub-group.

June Love noted that PRAG(D) were looking at comparisons of these detection systems with SEPA. This would be an ongoing action until a conclusion was forthcoming.

5. UPDATE ON SEPA CONSULTATION: PERMIT VARIATION FOR DOUNREAY LOW LEVEL WASTE FACILITY

Gillian Coghill noted that there have been robust discussions regarding the waste criteria for SEPA’s consultation on the permit variation for the new low level waste facility and this had expanded into discussions on the waste in the existing site LLW pits.

In terms of the permit variation, DSG had submitted a high level response and had encouraged those who wished to get into more technical detail to submit their own response. Of note, David Craig (Caithness West Community Council) had gone into a lot more technical detail on waste and half-lives of certain wastes. He had spoken with the chair raising the fact he still had concerns and issues around this topic. As Dave Craig had tendered his apologies for this meeting, Gillian Coghill suggested that the subject could be held over until the July sub-group meeting.

Stewart Ballantine stated that if there were questions around the ongoing permit determination there would be limits to what SEPA could say, adding SEPA will be as open as they could be in relation to the permit variation but until SEPA had determined the application little comment could be made.

He noted that David Craig had submitted a response and confirmed it had raised a number of points that the SEPA team were looking into as part of the determination and they would be interested in

his views on the pits. Further, in relation to the pits, SEPA would go through due process to assess the case for the LLW pits whether that be disposal to the NLLW Vaults or in-situ.

Gillian Coghill noted that David Craig had raised concerns about the inventory of both the pits and also the shaft. He felt that as he had some knowledge of the inventories he was equally qualified to raise these issues.

Gillian Coghill asked whether under the new permit arrangements this would mean less reporting by DSRL to SEPA about what waste was being disposed of in the vaults. Stewart Ballantine responded the reporting requirements would remain the same.

Gillian Coghill noted that the New LLW facility was due to be deemed 'no danger' after 300 years. She asked if the new variation, which could allow for long-lived uranium and plutonium, would extend the 'no danger' point beyond this date. Stewart Ballantine responded that the original application and Environmental Safety Case which supported the application had been assessed against the Guidance on Requirement for Authorisation that sets out the limits for what is acceptable for near surface disposal such as LLW pits. The inventory recognised these radionuclides and the long lived nature of them, and the overall assessment was within the boundaries of regulation. In addition to the upper dose limit SEPA expect DSRL to demonstrate how they have applied their waste management process to drive this level down as low as possible. The application for variation does not challenge this. However, he caveated that the determination process was ongoing, and SEPA would review, assess and validate the information that was in the environmental safety case that supports the application.

Stewart Ballantine also noted that at the end of the determination process there would be further consultation and a supporting decision document. At that point SEPA would be in a position to answer all questions raised. He noted that he would be happy to bring along the lead officer to the DSG meeting to answer questions.

Frederic Stalin added that DSRL had an obligation to apply BPM (Best Practicable Means) to demonstrate the site was optimising the waste.

Niall Watson noted, in his capacity of his role within DSRL, he could confirm there was a lot of scrutiny relating to waste management both by the site and the regulators. He added that from a DSG point of view members needed to be assured that any changes to the permit were not going to cause an adverse impact on the environment or safety.

Gillian Coghill thanked everyone for their input.

6. DOUNREAY UPDATE

Gillian Coghill noted a number of written papers had been distributed to members in advance of the meeting including:

- DSG(2022)P010: Dounreay Report
- DSG(2022)P011: SEPA Report
- DSG(2022)P012: ONR Report

Dounreay: (DSG(2022)P010 refers)

Frederic Stalin, Strategic Programme Director, Dounreay stated he would take the paper as read and noted the following:

- Work was progressing on the joining of Dounreay and Magnox with the focus on the board arrangement and around site licensing. There were no major issues at this stage. The Dounreay Management structure will remain as is and funding for the site will be ring fenced.
- Most of the COVID-19 arrangements were lifted on 25th April in alignment with national guidance. The site continued to retain some arrangements.
- An operator received a hand injury resulting in attendance at the hospital where they required stitches.
- The recent PFR sodium tank excursion was currently under investigation.
- A number of lifting incidents have been highlighted. This was of concern to site and the regulator and was being investigated.
- DSRL had received an ONR Enforcement Letter regarding construction related incidents, in particular on Construction (Design and Management) Regulations (CDM). Site management were working with the regulator to address the issues.
- There had been a step change in terms of the NDA sustainability strategy and there was a route map for site to drive some of these initiatives.
- FCA has been trialling the use of robotics in terms of investigating the potential for some decommissioning activities. This was at an early stage, the trial having shown the potential for deploying this technology in more complex areas.
- Graeme Dunnett had been appointed as Head of Reactors taking over from Phil Cartwright who retired in February.

Ian Rogers provided assurances on the Magnox/Dounreay joining noting that that ONR would be seeking to ensure that the site remained unique. Discussions with ONR were ongoing in relation to site licensing.

David Broughton noted the decommissioning in D1217 had been completed and asked where the 5 and 7 tonne blocks of concrete would be disposed. Frederic Stalin responded that he did not have that detail to hand but would take this as an action to get the information.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A002: Frederic Stalin to find out where the concrete blocks from D1217 will be disposed.

David Broughton noted that the DFR crane rail looked like a large refurbishment job for a relatively small area where the crane had failed. He could not understand why they had to replace the whole crane rail asking why something could not have been fabricated to solve the issue. Frederic Stalin took an action to provide this information. He added that the site did take the condition of aging assets and the lengthening programme into account when carrying out work like this.

ACTION - DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A003: June Love to contact John Saunders for an update on the DFR Crane rail replacement.

David Broughton asked if G4S (Guard force) was different from CNC and what did they do that differed from CNC. Frederic Stalin responded that G4S was the civil guard force who carried out bag checks etc for entry to site. CNC were on site to provide security for the Category 1 material. Niall Watson explained that several years ago the routine security checks that had previously been undertaken by the CNC were transferred to a civilian security company, Profile Security, and that Profile Security had now been replaced by G4S. .

David Broughton noted the incident at PFR sodium tanks and asked if anyone had been in the vicinity whether it could have resulted in injuries. Frederic Stalin noted there had been no injuries but until the investigation was concluded it was difficult to say. David Broughton noted that it drew a parallel with the explosion at Vulcan (central heating boiler) noting that if anyone had been in that facility they would have been killed. Frederic Stalin responded that the PFR incident was not an explosion but an excursion and there had been no harm to people or environment.

David Broughton noted the use of robotics in D1200 and asked if this was an area that could be filled with concrete and left in situ as part of the site end state instead of using tax payers' money for expensive robotics. Frederic Stalin responded that it could not be prejudged and at this stage work was ongoing to develop the options. Frederic Stalin added that BPM would be taken into account when looking at in-situ disposal. End state optimisation would continue to be developed.

Ian Rogers noted, re robotics, that DSRL had been approached by a university to be used as proof of concept so it should not have been a cost burden at this stage for the UK taxpayer. This was part of the innovation agenda to introduce new technology to decommissioning and to use DSRL to prove a concept. The trials taking place were looking to characterise the hazard by allowing robotics to access difficult areas and carry out a visual and radiological check of the hazard to decide on best technology.

Roger Saxon noted that staff were still working from home, the Ormlie Hub or Dounreay.com. He asked if there was pressure from Government or NDA for people to go back to their normal place of work as it was prior to Covid. Frederic Stalin responded that there was no pressure from anyone. Works continue on 're-imagining the workplace' whereby staff can discuss the needs and requirements to agree a mix of home/site working.

Niall Watson noted that the DSRL unions were keeping an eye on this. The business had asked the management chain to understand people's aspirations. Niall Watson made the point that there were three things DSRL needed to understand - business need, personal preference and thinking about others. Another way of looking at this is that, although individual job roles and the customers those job roles need to support have not changed, Covid has shown that for certain roles a lot more can be done remote from site than previously thought.

Frederic Stalin agreed that there is no intent to have everyone back to site however there was a need to have a certain amount of people on site to support the ongoing work. There was no intention to force people back to site where this can be accommodated by others means.

Roger Saxon asked regarding the environmental non-compliance in relation to non-isokinetic sampling. Stewart Ballantine responded this was where a sampler goes out of its operational range for a period of time. There had been an anomaly in the flow rate in a duct for a vent system which in turn meant the reported discharges reported to SEPA were invalid and had to be validated. Niall Watson added that the reason the sampler needs to operate isokinetically is so that the sample is representative of what is being discharged.

Gillian Coghill noted that staff working from home would have a positive impact on the environment as well as they would not be using fuel and roads and also had the potential to impact on the local shops with the use of Dounreay.com and the Ormlie office. Frederic Stalin responded that it also provided positive impacts in terms of site requirements for heating and electricity. All these factors would be taken into account with the accommodation strategy.

Gillian Coghill stated that at the last Buldoo Residents meeting, Graeme Morgan had discussed the grouting of LLW containers in stages and asked if this had started. She also noted that Buldoo residents had asked why site was still importing rock as residents were concerned about the noise and pollution. In addition, they had asked why, if planning to construct another two LLW vaults, was rock being imported when the rock from the excavated vaults could be used instead. Frederic Stalin responded that strategically site was looking at how rock imports could be minimised by utilising existing rock from site. This was a management change that had been raised and was now being considered.

There being no further questions, Gillian Coghill thanked Frederic Stalin for his update.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P011 refers) Stewart Ballantine, SEPA provided the following report:

- BPM and Optimisation are terms SEPA are guilty of widely using when talking about site matters which may not be clear to everyone what we mean by those. A key part of the demonstration of BPM being applied is using resources effectively, efficiently, economically and in a manner that is publicly acceptable. As an example, if one looked at the onsite pits and dug that out the waste, it then requires to be disposed of elsewhere and additional vault space constructed.
- SEPA have been working in conjunction with ONR regarding Dounreay joining with Magnox and were content with the way things are going. They have received some underpinning documents and were expecting an application for transfer of the EASR permits which would be a like for like transfer. EASR does not allow for changes to permit conditions or site limits as part of a transfer.
- Two new inspectors had been allocated to support Dounreay site regulation. David Stone was one of the key determination officers for the original LLW facilities application and had been involved with end state work previously. He is primarily working as a Magnox inspector for Chapelcross but would be supporting the regulation of Dounreay also in future. Corynne McGuire comes from a scientific background and more recently has been working as a principal policy officer for SEPA. She is currently completing a PhD on Particles. The addition of both would bring a broader range of skills and provides more resilience to SEPA's regulation of Dounreay.
- With reference to the PFR incident there was an ongoing investigation by DSRL and SEPA would assess the outcome. The DSRL process notifying SEPA and providing information overnight as well as the SEPA internal arrangements had both worked well.

Gillian Coghill thanked Stewart Ballantine for his input and invited questions from members.

Going back to the question on options and BPM and economic issues, David Broughton asked whether the cost per death of 1 in a million continued to be one of the criteria.

Stewart Ballantine noted that it was not a criteria he was aware of and certainly did not feed into anything within the environment sphere. Ian Rogers responded that this was part of a document “Reducing Risk Protecting People (R2P2)” which had come about at the time of the Sizewell B public enquiry and cited that spend up to £2M pound equates to one life saved.

There were no further questions for SEPA.

ONR: (DSG(2022)P012 refers) Ian Rogers, ONR provided the following report:

- The ONR report covered the period 1 January to 31 March 2022. In that period ONR safety inspectors made two visits to site covering a broad range of topics, including management of operations including control and supervision, emergency preparedness, radiological protection, and organisational capability. Organisational capability remains a key theme for ONR.
- ONR had observed the emergency arrangements exercise to demonstrate the management and recovery of multiple radiologically contaminated casualties. This followed the outcome of the last level 1 site exercise where this had been identified as an area of improvement. They also provided feedback to the site executive team and operations staff on the safety and security culture assessment that had been conducted at the end of last year. ONR considers that the feedback was well received and were satisfied that the key recommendations identified by the review were being considered appropriately.
- ONR continue to have regular meetings with Josh George, Organisational Excellence Director, to review the development and implementation progress of Dounreay’s cultural improvement programme.
- In the period of this report there were three non-routine events
 - Breach of a criticality operating rule following the processing of contaminated material within one of the gloveboxes in the FCA. Follow up enquires had been completed and ONR were satisfied that there had been no degradation in criticality safety margins nor were there failure in the lines of defence inherent in DSRL’s arrangements.
 - Lifting operations at the LLW Vaults falls out with ONR’s regulatory jurisdiction as the vaults are not located on the nuclear licensed site. However, ONR had taken a keen interest as this represents a further lifting incident following the Enforcement Letter served on Grahams Construction Limited.
 - During nitrogen dewar filling operations, a member of staff stepped back and fell off the dewar. ONR are awaiting the results of the investigation into this incident.
- ONR has sent two enforcement letters
 - To Grahams Construction Limited to address issues identified in the management of contractors against the requirements of the Construction (Design & Management) Regulations (CDM) and the conduct of lifting operations against the requirements of the Lifting Operations and Lifting Equipment Regulations (LOLER).
 - To Dounreay to address issues identified in the management of contractors against the requirements of Construction (Design & Management) Regulations and, their arrangements for the reporting, investigation and learning from incidents on site against the requirements of Nuclear Site Licence Condition 7.

- Ian Rogers noted that at the public meeting Tor Justad asked for assurances on site security given recent events in Ukraine. Ian Rogers informed the members that ONR considered a cyber-attack as the most credible threat to a GB Nuclear Site resulting from this conflict. A team of ONR Cyber Security & Information Assurance Specialist Inspectors had already conducted an assessment of DSRL's arrangements for the identification, monitoring and response to a cyber-attack.

Vik Winspear-Roberts provided an update on other ONR news. Of note:

- NGO forum was held on 17 March. There were 22 NGO representatives from 15 different organisations. These meetings are held twice per year with ONR Chief Nuclear Inspector and Senior Leadership Team in attendance.
- Rolls Royce Small Modular Reactors Limited had entered step 1 of generic design assessment which ONR and EA carry out. BEIS made the request to the regulators following its readiness review of the Rolls Royce application.
- AWE Burghfield and EDF Dungeness site B had moved out of enhanced regulatory attention to routine regulatory attention.
- An Improvement notice had been served on Sellafield Ltd after a worker fell from a scaffolding ladder. This investigation was still ongoing.

Gillian Coghill thanked Ian Rogers and Vik Winspear-Roberts for their input and invited questions from members.

Roger Saxon noted the two enforcement notices and asked if they were linked to the D3100 incident. Ian Rogers responded that this was not the case as the D3100 incident happened after the enforcement letters had been served.

There being no further questions, Gillian Coghill thanked Ian Rogers and Vik Winspear Roberts for their input.

CNC: Supt Ian Davies reported the following:

- CNC had been inspected by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary with a focus on organisational culture and how that relates to the operation of Dounreay and other sites with CNC presence. The initial report had been relatively positive however the final report was yet to be received.
- CNC and Police Scotland engagement had been reinvigorated. He has met with the Divisional Commander and they had effectively agreed three key parts to their relationship: CNC assistance within 5 km of the site and an agreement with planned support to Police Scotland with some CNC specialist support beyond the 5 km limit. The footprint outside the fence will improve.
- CNC responded to the PFR excursion and took appropriate action on the night and take comfort with the speed and efficiency in which they dealt with their core responsibilities to the incident.
- The potential change to the governance and ownership of Vulcan was likely to have some implications in terms of footprint and what it would mean in protecting the sites. This would continue to be worked through as the options for Vulcan developed.

Gillian Coghill thanked Supt Ian Davies for his input and invited question from members. There were no questions from members.

7. VULCAN UPDATE

Gillian Coghill noted the following written updates had been provided:

- DSG(2022)P013: Vulcan update
- DSG(2022)P014: Rolls Royce update
- DSG(2022)P011: SEPA
- DSG(2022)P009: ONR
- DSG(2022)P015: DNSR

MOD Vulcan: (DSG(2022)P013refers) Cdr Ian Walker highlighted the following:

- Minor first aid case when a contractor caught a finger in a door.
- There was a steam leak in the MCP test bed in February. A gasket failed and led to a steam leak. This was not a reportable event to DNSR or ONR. An investigation is ongoing as to why the gasket failed and the suitability of the maintenance regime. There were no injuries.
- The site continues to comply with UK, Scottish Government and MOD COVID-19 guidelines. They were reducing mitigation measure and emphasising to all that if they display any symptoms of COVID or any other contagious illness they should not come to site.
- The site recognises working remotely and there is an encouragement to come back in a limited basis as it was also recognised there was a benefit of people interacting.
- There have been no challenge to the Approval of Arrangements (AOA) limits during this period. From an environmental improvement perspective the site had implemented a trial 'No mow May' in a small area of the site .
- The annual security exercise would be held in June this year and the Annual Nuclear response demonstration in November.
- DNSR had undertaken a routine inspection in April.
- A new Decommissioning Programme Lead, Glen Dawkins, had been appointed and is due to start in May. Cdr Ian Walker would continue to oversee the site functions.

Gillian Coghill thanked Cdr Ian Walker for his update.

There were no questions from members.

Rolls Royce Update: (DSG(2022)P014 refers)

Gillian Coghill noted that there was no Rolls Royce attendance at this meeting. If members wished to raise any questions that could not be responded to these would be actioned through the minutes.

- Roger Saxon noted that it was good to see they had taken on a further four apprentices and 20 Rolls Royce permanent positions. June Love noted that the permanent positions were primarily contractor conversions.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P011 refers)

- Stewart Ballantine noted that SEPA has been party to some of the discussions and lead up to Vulcan considerations on potential transfer of the site to the NDA. They were supportive of the proposal.

ONR: (DSG(2022)P009 refers: Vik Winspear Roberts noted the report was updated twice per year, took the paper as read and asked if there were any questions.

- Roger Saxon noted in the report there was no requirement for Regulation 18 (Emergency exposure - employees) to be demonstrated and asked for some clarification. Vik Winspear Roberts responded that this issue was looking for a more challenging scenario to test this out. Regulation 18 was part of REPPIR and the key point was that the exercise scope did not include this in the scenario therefore for the next exercise they were looking to influence that this was taken into account if appropriate.

Cdr Ian Walker noted that during these exercises there was a need to bring in realism to the scenario and thus it was challenging to find scenarios that allowed all the arrangements to be demonstrated whilst also retaining a degree of realism.

Ian Rogers noted credible scenarios was something also being raised with Dounreay as at the last level 2 exercise it had been difficult to get a credible offsite consequence. He had been working with ONR Central Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) team and they have agreed to try a modular approach. ONR had asked Dounreay to demonstrate aspects of these arrangements and how this would contribute to the exercise as a whole. They have agreed with Highland Council that the level 2 exercise would be a separate exercise and they would generate a scenario and run this as a tabletop exercise to provide a mechanism that site can provide input and enable HC to provide a better demonstration of the off-site response. For Vulcan, it would be DNSR to decide what the best way was for Vulcan but it may be something to discuss with James Bryson.

DNSR: (DSG(2022)P015refers)

Gillian Coghill noted that James Bryson, DNSR was unavailable to attend. She added if members wished to raise any questions that could not be responded to these would be actioned through the minutes.

Gillian Coghill invited questions from members. No questions were raised.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

Gillian Coghill noted the correspondence since the last meeting had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. Of note:

- DSG(2022)C007: Scottish Government update. Gillian Coghill noted that this had been provided for the March Public meeting.

David Broughton raised concerns regarding the higher activity waste policy. He noted that Scottish Government were not doing a consultation and were focusing on the strategy. This would mean they were not re-engaging with the rest of the UK on the geological disposal project or Higher Activity Waste at Dounreay that would not fit with near surface storage criteria.

ACTION DSG(2022)M001/A004: DSG to respond and ask for clarity around the Higher Activity Waste Policy Review.

- Correspondence 19 was the presentation by Mark Rouse and Iain Lyall on the Near Term Work Plan and Shaft/Silo Project that was presented at the March Public Meeting.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Before opening up to other members, Gillian Coghill noted the following:

- The socio economic sub-group had discussed the response from Maree Todd to DSG's letter concerning the disappointment about her press comments about nuclear. The Business meeting had discussed this and agreed to request a face to face meeting with DSG members. It was agreed that this would not be a public meeting as this would probably not be conducive to a good discussion. In her response she offered to involve other Ministerial colleagues but it had been agreed that a first step would be to hold discussions with Maree Todd as the area's MSP. A date for this meeting was currently awaited.

Niall Watson asked if there was an understanding of the outcomes that DSG was expecting from this meeting. June Love responded that this would be discussed at the Business meeting and then circulated to the DSG members for comments.

- Thelma Mackenzie asked what the timeline was for the non-active drain with regards SEPA's warning letter. Stewart Ballantine responded that in the middle of last year a final warning letter had been served on DSRL in relation to unauthorised discharge of activity via the non-active drainage route. DSRL were undertaking a programme of work to address this as there has been a further occurrence. Sampling had been carried out by SEPA labs that showed further measurable low levels of activity. These levels would not cause an impact on human health or the environment. There had been some delays and DSRL had not progressed the work in the timeline. DSRL were now undertaking a programme of work to be completed by the end of April. To ensure work was progressed, resourced, and provided to SEPA they utilised a mechanism of EASR to require the site to provide the information. They had taken DSRL's timeline and programme and added a month to allow for slippage and agreed this with the site and served the information notice in February. This was only the first stage of the programme and SEPA would be following up with DSRL.

10. CLOSE

There being no further business, Gillian Coghill thanked everyone for their input and formally closed the meeting.

Gillian Coghill
DSG Site Restoration sub-group chair
11th May 2022

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING

DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A001: DSG to request feedback with respect to the NDA Business plan not bearing relation to the new Life Time Plan

DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A002: Frederic Stalin to find out where the blocks from D1217 will be disposed.

DSG/SRSG(2022)M001/A003: June Love to contact John Saunders for an update on the DFR Crane rail replacement.

DSG(2022)M001/A004: DSG to respond and ask for clarity around the Higher Activity Waste Policy Review.