

DOUNREAY STAKEHOLDER GROUP**SITE RESTORATION SUB-GROUP**

Minutes of the DSG Site Restoration sub-group meeting held on Wednesday 20th July 2022 at 1900 hours in the Georgina lounge, Pentland Hotel and via MS Teams.

Present:	Gillian Coghill	DSG Site Restoration sub-group chair (Buldoos Residents Chair)
	Cllr Willie Mackay	Highland Council
	Roger Saxon	DSG honorary member
	Thelma Mackenzie	Thurso Community Council
	Niall Watson	Dounreay Unions
	Cllr Andrew Jarvie	Highland Council
	David Craig	Caithness West Community Council
	David Broughton	DSG Co-opted Member of the Public
	Tor Justad	DSG Co-opted Member of the Public

In addition:	Dawn Clasper	DSG Minute Secretary
	June Love	Dounreay Community Relations Manager (DSG Secretariat)
	Craig Brown	DSRL, Head of Strategic Planning
	Barrie Cran	DSRL, Director of Assurance
	Cdr Ian Walker	MOD Vulcan
	Lt Cdr Philip Alexander	MOD Vulcan
	James Francis	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. She introduced James Francis, ONR attending tonight as a new site inspector for Dounreay.

She also welcomed Barrie Cran, DSRL, Director of Assurance and Craig Brown DSRL Head of Strategic Planning to the meeting. Craig was deputising for Frederic Stalin who was not available for this meeting and Barrie Cran was attending to discuss any safety topics. She noted that Barrie Cran required to leave early as he was travelling down for his daughter's graduation and therefore suggested that the discussion on safety was taken first and then would revert back to the agenda. This was agreed.

Safety

Gillian then handed over to Barrie Cran to provide an update. Barrie Cran noted the following:

- A series of investigations had been carried out into the PFR Sodium Tank Farm. While he was content to provide a more detailed brief he noted that during the investigation a question had been raised about an individual's behaviour and this would be treated discretely with no further

information provided on that matter.

- ONR had attended site and conducted preliminary enquiries into the PFR Sodium Tank Farm event and had issued an Enforcement letter with two regulatory hold points and a Level 3 regulatory issue. This provides the site with specific actions that are required to be undertaken. The first response was due on 28th July and until such times that ONR was satisfied the site would not be permitted to restart commissioning operations at the tank farm nor the Water Vapour Nitrogen process at PFR.
- All actions were being worked through via a formal process and all issues were included in an impediments register to control and manage the actions.
- SEPA was also carrying out an investigation and the outcome of this was currently awaited.
- A key focus of the learning from this event was around some specific issues about the project and where ONR Enforcement focusses. There were various actions that underpinned this.
- The site had taken upon themselves to look at how to manage the commissioning of work. This needed to be properly controlled to ensure the right assessment criteria were identified to make sure a level of discipline was applied properly. For example, this could be through different disciplines for nuclear and/or chemical aspects.
- There were various activities across the design arrangements and culture was one of the areas that was being focussed on.

Gillian Coghill thanked Barrie for his update and invited members to raise any questions. Of note:

- David Broughton asked whether the site was going back in history to see what experiments were done with water vapour nitrogen in the past. He recalled back in the 1980s when DFR NaK started there had been a series of projects to do with DFR. He asked whether the site was still in the experimental stage with water vapour nitrogen.

Barrie Cran responded that there was a lot of experience with water vapour nitrogen and the learning from DFR had crossed into the PFR reactor. Because of the physical form of the tanks it was decided to assess the HAZOP (Hazard and Operability) and not carry out water vapour nitrogen in the traditional way. There were a few aspects the site had thought were extremely unlikely and could be applied better. Building on that learning, a slightly different process had been applied and had found things that had not been expected to happen. From either a nuclear or chemical point of view it was recognised there was a need to ensure that any changes to process were properly understood.

- David Broughton noted that the more sodium that was destroyed, the more dangerous it became to clean out the remaining sodium.

Barrie Cran noted that this was understood and one such example was the need to ensure all of the surfaces are clean.

- Roger Saxon asked what the nature of the hold points were? Were these organisational or technical hold points?

- Barrie Cran responded the hold points covered both and it had been made clear that there would be no progress until the criteria set by ONR had been achieved. The full set of criteria to release the regulatory hold point had not yet been set. There would be two hold points, one for the tank farm and one for reactor internals. The criteria would be a mix of training, technical, admin and this would be agreed with ONR.

The second challenge was on culture. A different approach had been taken with the recently held safety stand-downs. Usually these would have been driven top down, however this time there had been a team taken from across all disciplines of the site and had been facilitated by the Assurance Director ensuring that the team took the lead in developing the stand-downs.

A survey on safety culture had received over 1000 comments and these had been grouped together where there were similarities in comments. The work to consider the actions coming from these comments were now underway and the focus for the actions going forward would be to take into account real learning. The intention was to feedback to the workforce how these comments were taken on board and turned into meaningful actions.

- Dave Craig noted that over 1000 comments had been received during the safety survey and asked if there had been a lot of commonality across those.

Barrie Cran responded that there was a mix. There had been clusters about communications, relationships, reporting and learning which were things that were previously known about and were already being worked on. There were individual comments which tended to be a very individual concern or about particular team concerns. Care was being taken to ensure that the gems within individual or specific team issues were not lost and there was a list of comments that were picked up as 'red flags'. In general, it was hoped to be able to respond to individual comments but recognised this may not be completely possible because of the anonymity of the survey.

- Dave Craig asked whether priority would be given to those with common themes?

Barrie Cran confirmed this would be the case.

- Stewart Ballantine, SEPA noted that earlier in the safety briefing there had been mention of SEPA's investigation yet to be reported. SEPA's investigation was ongoing and is awaiting details on what discharges had occurred because of the incident. At this point DSRL need to go through the proper process to safely access the plant to collect and analysis samples to estimate what discharge had occurred. This was the reason why the SEPA investigation had not yet concluded.
- Tor Justad asked how long the process would take, when would the results be available and when restrictions would be lifted?

Barrie Cran responded that this would be dependent on how long the enquiry process took and how actions to be taken were progressed.

- Tor Justad asked if there was an indication, would it take days, weeks, years?

Barrie Cran responded that it would take as long as it took. The important thing was making sure the right criteria were agreed and then progressing the actions required to address these properly.

There being no further questions, Gillian Coghill thanked everyone for their input.

Before moving on to apologies, Gillian Coghill noted that the role of deputy sub group chair had been previously discussed at the April meeting but no decision had been made because the outcome

of the Highland Council elections had potential to change HC membership. Cllr Willie Mackay, incumbent deputy sub group chair, had been re-elected and remained on DSG but had indicated his desire to step down from the deputy chair role.

She also noted two new Councillors to the DSG (Karl Rosie and Andrew Jarvie) and both had been invited to both sub groups today to allow them to consider the most appropriate sub group for them. Willie Mackay would remain on the site restoration sub group as a member.

With Cllr Mackay stepping down as deputy chair there was a need to identify someone for this role. She stated that unless anyone wished to volunteer for this she would like to ask Roger Saxon whether he would be willing to step up, noting that Roger had previous experience as DSG chair attending both sub groups on a regular basis. Roger Saxon responded that he would be happy to take on this role unless anyone else had a desire to volunteer. No further nominations were tabled, and Roger Saxon was proposed by Gillian Coghill and seconded by Thelma Mackenzie.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:

- Frederic Stalin, DSRL Strategic Programme Manager, Craig Brown deputising
- Cllr Karl Rosie, Highland Council
- Ian Rogers, ONR (Principal Inspector for Dounreay)
- James Bryson, DNSR

3. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Gillian Coghill noted that the minutes of the last meeting – DSG/SRSG(2022)M02, 27th April 2022 – had been endorsed at the public meeting held in June. Therefore, these minutes were a true record of the meeting.

She invited members to raise anything from the minutes. No issues were raised.

4. ACTION STATUS

Gillian Coghill noted that the status of actions had been circulated to all members. The majority of these actions had been closed out fairly quickly with a few outstanding ones following on from a meeting with Maree Todd, MSP.

She noted the action on Stewart Ballantine with regards PRAG(D) and the comparison of particle detection systems. Stewart Ballantine noted that this was covered in the SEPA written report. (See action status of update on this action).

5. UPDATE ON WASTE TOPICS

Gillian Coghill reminded members that a response from DSG had been submitted to SEPA on the permit variation that SEPA had consulted on. DSG had chosen to keep their response at a high level and had encouraged individuals to submit comment in more detail if appropriate. She added that Dave Craig, representing Caithness West Community Council, had responded in more detail and had raised some further questions in terms of the site's waste streams. As Dave had not been able to attend the last sub group meeting the subject had been held over and that had given time to allow a meeting between Gillian Coghill, Dave Craig and DSRL's Graeme Morgan and Colin Munro. Gillian Coghill felt that the meeting had been useful and that it had gone into some detail. She then invited Dave to feedback his thoughts.

Dave Craig noted the following:

- As a general point, he had submitted a more detailed response to SEPA and they had responded indicating they may wish to follow this up further. He added that he was happy to do so.
- His over-riding issue was that the waste being proposed to be put into the new low level waste vaults had long lived alpha and the points he was making were in the context of the community and the longer term. At some point the facility would erode into the sea (a 10,000 year estimate) but that some of the wastes that would be in the facility had half lives of millions of years. His question had been would it be possible to segregate the higher fraction of long lived waste and minimise the impact for future generations.
- The discussion with DSRL was quite full and there was a lot of nodding and discussion on new technology that may come along in the future. As an example, the shaft met guidelines for the disposal of waste in the early 1960/70s but by 1990 the decision was made that the shaft would need to be emptied. Regulation had changed within a 40 year timeline. Therefore, the argument being it is not a responsibility of the site to sort out this waste now in the likelihood that the criteria could change over the next 30-40 years and then the waste in the LLW facility would not meet (new) regulation.

David Broughton stated that he understood the question that was being asked but questioned where that waste would go if it was not disposed of in the low level waste facility. That would mean it would need to go into a waste store and that there was a possibility that that would inflict as much harm to future generations as compared to disposing of it in the vaults. By putting the waste into a store raised the question of whether that would be a safer option.

Tor Justad asked if the waste had to go to a store would that be high activity waste or would it be sentenced as low level waste albeit with a fraction of longer-lived radio-nuclides? Dave Craig responded that this would need to be a political decision and not something that could be agreed around the table. There was already low level waste from Scottish sites being taken down to England for treatment and disposal. What would be required would be an agreement for the higher alpha waste to be taken from Dounreay for disposal elsewhere. The option would need to be considered in the context of the Scottish HAW policy.

Dave Craig noted that there had been a discussion with the Scottish Government Radwaste team when they had visited site earlier in July and this was a topic that had been raised. The Radwaste team were looking to get some clarity for some of their policy decisions.

David Broughton noted that the waste going into the proposed GDF in England would not be able to take low level waste as the waste being disposed of would be intermediate level waste and spent fuel. There was a need to be careful when talking about waste because of the categories and routes for specific wastes.

Cllr Willie Mackay noted the comments on climate change and the potential blight for future generations. Dave Craig noted that safety cases would look at things like climate change, coastal erosion etc and the case would need to demonstrate that. As pointed out previously though, the shaft was a good example of meeting the standards of the day but would never meet the current standards of regulation.

David Broughton noted that the GDF for the rest of the UK still required a fully completed design and on the basis of a GDF meant that the waste would not be interfered with following disposal. The fact was that geology looks after it not man. Anything above ground means that man looks after it.

Tor Justad also noted that none of the potential sites for GDF have been licensed and there continues to be no evidence it will ever work.

6. DOUNREAY UPDATE

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

- DSG(2022)P017: Dounreay Report
- DSG(2022)P018: SEPA Report
- DSG(2022)P019: ONR Report

Dounreay: (DSG(2022)P017 refers)

Craig Brown, Head of Strategic Planning Dounreay stated he would take the paper as read and noted the following:

- The Lifetime Plan (LTP) continues to be developed, one of the key aspects is to make the plan realistic, achievable, and challenging. Along with the plan is a Programme Business Case that is being developed to consider additional aspects of the LTP in terms of financial viability, commercial acceptability, management requirements, economic and strategic aspects. Stakeholders from site and from the community have been involved in the development of the business case. A key aspect of the LTP was to make sure the plan was long lasting and provided a good reference point with long term strategic support. The LTP was on schedule to be complete for internal approval by April 2023 and be in place by April 2024.
- The D1213 pipe bridge in the Fuel Cycle Area was being upgraded. This was linked to the Dounreay Materials Test Reactor (DMTR) project and supported various services going to DMTR. Some of the infrastructure is being removed from DMTR.
- D2001 was a key milestone and the first cell was now accessible to allow decommissioning. This was providing good information on how to progress the other suite of cells in the facility.
- The Dounreay Materials Test Reactor (DMTR) demolition continued with the removal of a reinforced 5 meter tall concrete fuel element storage block. A remote control demolition machine (BROKK) was used to break it apart.
- The D3100 team have started to trial the grouting process withing the LLW disposal vaults. This is to make sure the approach was correct and meeting the criteria for future long term requirements for the vaults.
- Two large chemical tanks that were previously used to hold sulphuric acid and caustic liquor have been removed from the front of the low level liquid effluent treatment plant (LLETP).
- Integration with LTP was being developed along with the Gate B Paper to implement the preferred option through decommissioning projects across the whole of the site.
- Dave Calder had been appointed as DSRL Head of Sustainability and Socio Economics and will take up his new post on Monday 8th August.

- DSRL recruitment had been placed on pause for 3 months unless there was a known specific skills or role shortage that cannot be recruited internally.
- Representatives from the FCA North project went to a nuclear facility in France on a fact-finding visit. The facilities have similar challenges to those in the FCA. This allows benchmarking and to learn lessons from the wider industry UK and overseas.
- The site's focus on EDI continued with a Step Across Women's Development Programme launched recently. This was open to all those who worked for DSRL.
- Dounreay held a celebration of innovation recently. There were four key areas being looked at in terms of technology that can be done remotely to move people away from harm, intelligent infrastructure, digital delivery and reducing waste.

Gillian Coghill thanked Craig Brown for his update and mentioned a discussion held at the socio economic sub group held in the afternoon where concerns had been raised around procurement and the local supply chain. She suggested that urgent attention was required. June Love noted there had been a robust discussion at the Socio Economic sub group and actions were already in hand.

Gillian Coghill then invited members to raise any questions. Of note:

- David Broughton noted that the first couple of paragraphs within the written report was work that would be ongoing until April 2024 in terms of developing the Life Time Plan and business case. He asked what was being done prior to 2024.

Craig Brown responded that decommissioning work was continuing with the Near Term Work Plan (a 3 year plan). The ongoing development of the LTP was to allow the site to take stock of resources, how best to use them and making sure the plan was sufficiently detailed to understand the key support required to deliver it and ensure it was achievable. Fit For Future was looking at a programmatic approach refocussing the site on 3 programmes.

- David Broughton noted that grouting was now underway in the low level waste vault but had been surprised to read that the columns were also being grouted and asked the reason why this was being undertaken now.

Craig Brown responded that he did not have that level of detail but would take an action to ensure a response was provided.

Action: DSG/SRSG(2022)M002/A001: Craig Brown to respond to question on why columns in new low level waste facility were being grouted now.

- David Broughton noted that the site end state delivery team continued to look at optimised end states and questioned why this was continuing as it had already been defined.

Craig Brown responded as mentioned previously things changed in terms of environment and regulatory guidance. There was a defined end state but site continued to review this position to reflect any changes that arise.

- David Broughton noted the pause on recruitment and asked whether people already on site were being retrained and upskilled to enhance the development of the existing workforce.

Craig Brown responded that since going back into the One NDA Group it had opened up a number of opportunities for the workforce. For Dounreay, the first step would be to develop the LTP and then develop the skills utilising the existing workforce where appropriate.

- David Broughton noted he had previously spent 11 years building a chemical plant in North of England where there was not so much a need to think about the local supply chain. At Dounreay this was different and the local supply chain would be important to support the decommissioning efforts of the site.
- Tor Justad noted the visit to France and asked whether there was a visit report that outlined the learning that had been done by the team who had visited.

Craig Brown noted that there was always a requirement for those visiting different countries/sites to report back with the learning that had occurred and this visit would be no different. He would, however, need to go back and ask for the information to be provided.

Action: DSG/SRSG(2022)M002/A002: Craig Brown to provide the visit report of the recent visit to France.

- Niall Watson noted the concerns of the supply chain regarding (1) the pipeline of work from DSRL and (2) their ability to plan given that a LTP that would not be in place until 2024. What was needed was a credible plan that was realistic. There would be a lot of activities in the plan but it was important that aspects such as safety, ensuring protection of the environment, sustainability and social value etc. were fully integrated into the plan. On the issue of supply chain concerns he wondered whether there was scope to bridge the gap (in terms of providing a sufficient pipeline of work) for the supply chain while waiting for the completion of the LTP?

Craig Brown responded that one of the key aspects of the LTP was that of 'no surprises' which would be embedded in the detail. There would be a number of different aspects ongoing and the 5 key criteria across the business case included socio economics, sustainability and net zero. Additional support had been brought in to help develop these themes so they were part of a robust business case going forward. At this time there was a Near Term Work Plan that was in place and a lot of work already underway. Barrie Cran added there were also obligations that the site had to meet through the procurement legislation.

- Dave Craig asked whether the LTP was restricted to Dounreay decommissioning only or did it include other NDA sites? In the past, Dounreay had shown the way forward for both commercial and government decommissioning – will the LTP attempt to use Dounreay facilities to decommission items from other NDA sites? Will LTP consider use of Dounreay teams to lead decommissioning on other sites? Will LTP consider Vulcan now that NDA were making the case to take over the decommissioning of that site also. It was noted that at this point the site was developing a LTP for Dounreay but some of the Vulcan activity was already included given the services Dounreay already provided to the Vulcan site. The site was aware of the option for NDA to take forward Vulcan decommissioning and site personnel were involved within this project.
- Niall Watson believed there were opportunities to deliver the decommissioning of both the Dounreay and Vulcan sites in a way that could create a successful and sustainable future for the local community. This required a credible plan that took account of the things he mentioned above. There was also a need to consider how the local supply chain could be supported in the

intervening period before the LTP takes effect.

- Tor Justad noted earlier comments about nuclear and reminded members there were good opportunities for jobs within the renewables. Comment was made that questions asked of Maree Todd when she had met with DSG, including a response on the number of renewables jobs within the Caithness area, were yet to be answered.
- Cllr Andrew Jarvie stated that whenever there had been a discussion on the future of nuclear in the county it had always been countered by the opportunities within the renewable sector. He believed the county's argument should be a new nuclear station as renewables does not provide baseload power. With all the nuclear stations coming off line the only way to replace these was with nuclear or oil and gas. Caithness had the highest number of wind turbines per person in this country but appeared there were few job opportunities.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P018 refers): Stewart Ballantine noted the following:

- A new Chief Executive Nicole Paterson will join SEPA in October.
- In relation to David Craig's response to the consultation on the permit variation application for the LLW facility, the determining officer would likely be in contact with him at the appropriate stage in the determination process.
- There is ongoing engagement for the application to transfer the DSRL EASR (Environmental Authorisation (Scotland) Regulations) permits to Magnox. SEPA had received the application to transfer the site permit and the LLW facility permit. The transfer would not take place until next year. Discussions continued on the transfer of the waste management, CAR (Controlled Activities (Scotland) Regulations) and PPC (Pollution Prevention Control) permits that are also held by DSRL and these are being worked up and will be submitted to SEPA at the relevant time to determine. EASR does not allow for changes to permit conditions or site limits as part of a transfer, it can only be a like for like transfer.
- Response to Action DSG(2022)M02/A16: with regards PRAG(D) and the comparison of particle detection systems. Stewart Ballantine noted that this was covered in the SEPA written report.

Gillian Coghill then invited members to raise any questions. Of note:

- David Broughton stated that he found it strange that the site operator would not hold the permit and asked who in Magnox would these be transferring to and whether this was the same throughout the NDA.

Stewart Ballantine responded that Magnox, as the corporate legal entity, would hold the permits. This was the same throughout EASR, the permit for radioactive substance activity was held by the entity that was deemed to be in control of that activity. Once the joining of DSRL and Magnox was complete then Magnox would become the new entity holding all licences.

Barrie Cran noted that the people who are in control of the permits do not change but that the corporate body (Magnox) would change. From The Dounreay site's point of view, how the permits were controlled on a day to day basis did not change. This was merely reflecting the joining together of DSRL and Magnox and that the Company name (Magnox) and the registered office would change.

ONR: (DSG(2022)P019 refers): James Francis noted the following:

- As previously reported, there had been a lifting event with Grahams Construction where a worker trapped their hand while undertaking a lifting operation. Preliminary enquiries had been carried out and concluded that Grahams had already taken suitable action to rectify the issue and no further regulatory action was required.
- There were previously two Enforcement letters sent to DSRL and Grahams Construction around compliance with CDM regulations (control of site activities). ONR had visited the site to conduct enquiries and those have been successfully concluded although some long term monitoring will continue.
- ONR continued to engage with site on the LTP and end state and this will continue. ONR also continue to work with DSRL on the NTWP.
- ONR continues to engage with DSRL on safety culture. In addition, work is ongoing to review the joining of Dounreay and Magnox. The licence application has been received by ONR. Interviews were being conducted at both sites and will continue as part of ONR's due diligence.

Gillian Coghill thanked James Francis for his input and invited questions. Of note:

- Roger Saxon noted in the report a statement that said "Recommencement of the active commissioning of 'enhanced weathering' activities in support of resident sodium removal from Tank 2. He asked what 'enhanced weathering' meant?"

Barrie Cran responded that water vapour nitrogen (WVN) uses a combination of steam and inert atmosphere in order to ensure control. The process used in sodium tank 2 was not exactly the same and different methods are used to control the balance. In simple terms, enhanced weathering involves the delivery of air with a higher than normal water vapour concentration. Dave Craig added that it was a range of parameters that changes for each element of WVN process.

CNC: SI Ian Davies reported:

- Since 2016, Project Forss has been ongoing to ensure the robustness of a redesigned security model looking at future operational requirements in a reduced security environment. Over the last six years the model has changed and is now at a Gate 4 review (Infrastructure and Projects Authority looks at big sector projects and readiness for service). Final operating capability will be complete by September 2022 with the work undertaken over the past 6 years being signed off which will allow CNC to focus on what comes next. This will be undertaken in a staged process.
- CNC will take delivery of ballistically protected vehicles at Dounreay. These vehicles will be visible to the nearby community. It was emphasised that this was not as a result of a change of threat.
- While CNC main focus is to maintain security on site CNC does have 2 offsite facilities and consideration is underway on what to do with these facilities. The facilities include capacity at Forss and training facilities. As the site progresses with decommissioning there will be, at the appropriate time, no need for these.

There being no further questions relating to the Dounreay site, Gillian Coghill thanked everyone for their input.

7. VULCAN UPDATE

Gillian Coghill noted the following written updates had been provided:

- DSG(2022)P020: Vulcan update
- DSG(2022)P021: Rolls Royce update
- DSG(2022)P018: SEPA
- DSG(2022)P022: DNSR

MOD Vulcan: (DSG(2022)P020refers) Cdr Ian Walker highlighted the following:

- Lt Cdr Phil Alexander had replaced Lt Cdr Dave Chisholm as deputy. Lt Cdr Alexander had previously worked at Vulcan.
- There had been a couple of minor first aid cases reported in April - a recurrent back spasm and, in June, a cut to a finger. He noted there was an ambulance call out when a visitor to site took unwell but was able to complete his visit.
- There had been a minor event when a person had become contaminated. The dose was below reportable levels and the individual was decontaminated following standard site processes. DNSR was informed out of courtesy.
- There had been a RIDDOR reportable incident when a non-nuclear overhead crane failed to stop. The crane continued to lower at the same speed, there was no damage to the infrastructure or the ground. This was currently being investigated.
- The site has now reduced its COVID-19 mitigation measures and are emphasising to all those working that if they display any symptoms of COVID or any other contagious illness they should not come to site.
- Vulcan will become a 'no vaping' site from 1 August 2022.
- There had been no challenge to the Approval of Arrangements (AOA) limits during this period.
- The site undertook 'No May Mow' and as a result a number of flowers have grown encouraging rare types of bumble bees. As a result, this will now be included in arrangements to mow areas less.
- The annual security exercise was held in June and was a satisfactory demonstration of site's arrangements.
- The Lonestar exercise would take place in November with planning underway.
- DNSR had undertaken an inspection in June in relation to AC15 (Periodic Review of Safety). The report had been issued.
- The new Decommissioning Programme lead, Glenn Dawkins had visited site recently. He had also made a visit to Dounreay and met with members of the DSG working group.

Gillian Coghill thanked Cdr Ian Walker for his update and welcomed Lt Cdr Phil Alexander to the meeting. She invited members to raise any questions. Of note:

- Roger Saxon noted in relation to the DSMP1 Pond Fuel Removal, once the fuel had been removed there would be a large volume of water to discharge. He asked if SEPA had any issues in relation to the discharge of such a large quantity of water.

Cdr Ian Walker responded that they will not discharge the water immediately as it would cause a conventional H&S hazard, this was a long term decommissioning activity. The volume of water was not an issue.

Rolls Royce Update: (DSG(2022)P021 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.

- Tor Justad noted in paragraph 4 it states, 'At an appropriately aligned pace, we continue to progress our business planning and development for utilisation and deployment of our personnel and nuclear skills, in Caithness to 2025 and beyond.' He asked what "at an appropriately aligned pace" meant.

Cdr Ian Walker responded that Rolls Royce had a skilled workforce that they look to deploy to support the naval nuclear programme in the UK and this was aligning this support to the wider programme as well as delivering the Vulcan activities.

SEPA: (DSG(2022)P018 refers)

- Stewart Ballantine noted, on the point Roger Saxon made on future discharges, this was not specific to Vulcan. Any permit that is in place will have an authorisation limit for discharge to the environment and this would be assessed through the determination process and would be granted on the basis that the representative BPM (Best Practicable Means) discharge for that level, within acceptable constraints, and the overall dose limit were at an acceptable standard. This would be assessed to ensure they were within the limits set by international standards.

ONR: Vik Winspear Roberts noted there were no issues. She would be visiting site in November and discussing the RIDDOR reportable incident, this will be under routine regulatory business.

No questions were raised.

DNSR: (DSG(2022)P022refers)

Gillian Coghill noted that James Bryson, DNSR had tendered his apologies but noted that if any questions were raised from the report these would be actioned through provision of a written response. No questions were raised.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

Gillian Coghill noted that there was nothing to report at this time. All correspondence received had been circulated to members and had been dealt with.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

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

- A number of attempts had been made to co-ordinate a suitable date for all DSG members to meet to discuss the DSG review. This had proved difficult due to summer holidays and therefore the business meeting had agreed to consider the recommendations, taking on board the previous comments from DSG members and to outline a way forward. This had been discussed and agreed at the business meeting held on Tuesday 19th July and the document would be tidied up and circulated to members with specific questions to allow DSG members an opportunity to provide further comment prior to actions being taken. It was stressed that it was important for all DSG members to respond to this and once it was circulated members would be given until the end of August to respond. Currently work was ongoing to develop a simple form to make it easier for members to complete.

Action: DSG/SRSG(2022)M02/A003: All DSG members to provide comment on the DSG review to DSG Secretariat no later than 29th August 2022.

- A small group of the DSG representatives had met with the Scottish Government Radwaste Team on 12th July. The discussion focused on the Higher Activity Waste Policy and progress with review. The Scottish Government Radwaste team had indicated there would be an action plan set out to outline the timeline of the policy review by September 2022. The waste on the Dounreay site that did not fit within the policy was discussed and this was something that Scottish Government recognised. It was expected to see something in the policy review to acknowledge not everything is suitable for near-surface storage.
- Representatives of the DSG working group that had been set up to look at the joining of Dounreay and Magnox and also the Vulcan decommissioning had met with new MOD Project Director, Glenn Dawkins and Commander Ian Walker, Vulcan on 13th July.

This had been an informal meeting as it was an opportunity to meet Glenn for the first time in person although he had attended the last public DSG virtually. We discussed the timeline of the work that was required, and the plan is that the NDA will complete an outline business case by the end of this calendar year. This would go through NDA governance and if a decision to proceed was given a full business case would be developed thereafter. The group explored where/when DSG could provide input on topics such as social value and emphasise areas that are very important locally, like using the local supply chain. One question raised was on the 'value of Vulcan' today. The NDA social impact studies provide details of the benefits from Dounreay but there appeared to be no information on this for Vulcan. A request was made for Vulcan to provide some data on this.

Because the business case is something that NDA was developing it was felt that it would be useful for the working group to meet with NDA to understand the timelines for the production of both the outline and full business cases and explore where DSG could provide comment/input.

- At the Socio Economic sub group this afternoon David Alexander noted that he had asked David Peattie, NDA Chief Executive, to provide further re-assurance that the joining of these two entities did not mean substantial change for Dounreay in terms of organisational structure, budget and workforce. David Peattie was quite clear in his response, he said "My position on Dounreay joining with Magnox is crystal clear. Dounreay will always retain its uniqueness and ring fenced funding." It was noted that a full discussion on this would be reflected in the DSG Socio Economic sub group minutes.

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

30 July 2022

ACTIONS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING

DSG/SRSG(2022)M002/A001: Craig Brown to respond to question on why columns in new low level waste facility were being grouted now.

DSG/SRSG(2022)M002/A002: Craig Brown to provide the visit report of the recent visit to France.

DSG/SRSG(2022)M02/A003: All DSG members to provide comment on the DSG review to DSG Secretariat no later than 29th August 2022.