

**Generic design assessment  
UK EPR nuclear power plant design by  
AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA**

**Assessment report  
Radiological impact on  
members of the public**



We are the Environment Agency. It's our job to look after your environment and make it **a better place** - for you, and for future generations.

Your environment is the air you breathe, the water you drink and the ground you walk on. Working with business, Government and society as a whole, we are making your environment cleaner and healthier.

The Environment Agency. Out there, making your environment a better place.

Published by:

Environment Agency  
Rio House  
Waterside Drive, Aztec West  
Almondsbury, Bristol BS32 4UD  
Tel: 0870 8506506

Email: [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)

[www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

© Environment Agency

All rights reserved. This document may be reproduced with prior permission of the Environment Agency.

GEHO0510BSJX-E-E

## Generic design assessment

### UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA

#### Assessment report – Assessment of radiological impact on members of the public

<b>Protective status</b>	This document contains no sensitive nuclear information or commercially confidential information.
<b>Process and Information Document<sup>1</sup></b>	<p>The following sections of Table 1 in our Process and Information document are relevant to this assessment:</p> <p>Section 2.7 Prospective dose assessment for the generic site at the proposed limits for levels of discharge.</p> <p>Section 2.8 Collective dose assessments for discharges from the facility truncated at 500 years to the UK, European and World populations. Assumptions made in carrying out these assessments should be set out.</p> <p>Section 2.9 Sufficient assumed data for others to be able to carry out all dose assessments including as relevant</p>
<b>Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles<sup>2</sup></b>	<p>The following principles are relevant to this assessment:</p> <p>Fundamental Principle E – Protecting Human Health and the Environment</p> <p>SEDP1 General RSR Principle for siting new facilities - When evaluating sites for a new facility, account shall be taken of the factors that might affect the protection of people and the environment from radiological hazards and the generation of radioactive waste.</p> <p>SEDP2 Movement of radioactive material in the environment - Data shall be provided to allow the assessment of rates and patterns of movement of radioactive materials in the air and the aquatic and terrestrial environments around sites.</p> <p>SEDP3 Ambient radioactivity - Levels of ambient radioactivity around the sites of new facilities shall be assessed.</p> <p>SEDP4 Multi-facility sites - In the case of nuclear and other sites on which there are already one or more facilities, the radiological impact of the whole site on people and the environment shall be assessed when considering the suitability of the site for any new facility.</p> <p>RPDP1 Optimisation of protection - All exposures to ionising radiation of any member of the public and of the population as a whole shall be kept as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA), economic and social factors being taken into account.</p> <p>RPDP2 Dose limits and constraints - Radiation doses to individual people shall be below the relevant dose limits and constraints.</p> <p>RPDP4 Prospective dose assessments for radioactive discharges to the environment - Assessments of potential doses to people and to non-human species shall be made prior to granting any new or revised authorisation for the discharge of radioactive wastes into the environment.</p>

**Report author** Julie Tooley

1. Process and Information Document for Generic Assessment of Candidate Nuclear Power Plant Designs, Environment Agency, Jan 2007.  
<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0107BLTN-e-e.pdf>
2. Regulatory Guidance Series, No RSR 1: Radioactive Substances Regulation - Environmental Principles (REPs), 2010.  
<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0709BQSB-e-e.pdf>

## Table of contents

<b>1</b>	Summary .....	6
<b>2</b>	Introduction.....	7
<b>3</b>	Assessment.....	7
	3.1 Assessment methodology .....	8
	3.2 Assessment objectives .....	8
	3.3 EDF and AREVA documentation.....	9
	3.4 Summary of assessment findings.....	9
	3.5 EDF and AREVA's dose assessment.....	13
	3.6 Our independent assessment of doses from maximum expected discharges .....	14
	3.7 Our independent assessment of doses from discharges at our proposed limits .....	16
	3.8 Comparison to dose constraints and dose limits .....	18
<b>4</b>	Detailed findings .....	19
<b>5</b>	Public comments .....	19
<b>6</b>	Conclusion.....	19
<b>7</b>	Compliance with Environment Agency requirements .....	20
	References .....	23
	Abbreviations.....	25

## 1 Summary

- 1 We have assessed information in the generic design assessment (GDA) submission made by EDF and AREVA for the UK EPR with respect to prospective doses to members of the public as a result of the disposal of liquid and gaseous radioactive waste from the UK EPR to the environment.
- 2 We appointed contactors to undertake the verification and validation of assessments made by EDF and AREVA for the UK EPR at the generic site and to make an independent assessment of doses to members of the public from the UK EPR at the generic site.
- 3 We conclude that all the doses assessed by EDF and AREVA are below the dose constraint for members of the public of  $300 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  and the dose constraint recommended by the Health Protection Agency (HPA) for new build of  $150 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ .
- 4 We conclude that the sum of doses to the representative person at our proposed limits is below the source dose constraint.
- 5 A number of the sites listed in the Nuclear National Policy Statement as potentially suitable for a new nuclear power station are adjacent to existing nuclear power stations. In GDA the specific site at which a UK EPR might be located is not known but we consider in the light of our assessment that the highest total dose is estimated to be  $31 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  it is very unlikely that doses at the site will exceed the site dose constraint of  $500 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ . We consider that site dose should be assessed at the site-specific stage.
- 6 Comparison against the dose limit can only be done at site-specific permitting when contributions from all sources of radiation can be included.
- 7 In line with our usual procedures we will require a detailed site-specific impact assessment to be carried out at site-specific permitting based on the actual environmental characteristics of the proposed site to demonstrate that doses to members of the public and non-human species from the UK EPR at the proposed site will be ALARP and below relevant dose constraint and dose limits.
- 8 Our findings on the wider environmental impacts and waste management arrangements for the UK EPR reactor may be found in our Consultation Document (Environment Agency, 2010a).

## 2 Introduction

- 9 This assessment considers the radiological impact of the UK EPR on members of the public arising from discharges into the environment.
- 10 Regulation of public radiation exposure is shared between the Environment Agency (in England and Wales) and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). The Environment Agency regulates doses to the public resulting from discharges of radioactive waste into the environment during normal operation. HSE regulates doses to the public resulting from direct radiation (i.e. direct radiation originating from within the site boundary) during normal operation. HSE require site operators to measure direct radiation at the site perimeter and estimate exposure to a reference person on an annual basis. Direct radiation is radiation received directly from a source such as a nuclear power station, instead of indirectly as a result of radioactive discharges.
- 11 The assessment considers the information provided by Electricité de France SA and AREVA NP SAS (EDF and AREVA) for their UK EPR design.
- 12 We appointed contractors (Enviros Consulting Ltd) to make an independent assessment of environmental activity concentrations and radiological impact to members of the public from the UK EPR at the generic site (Environment Agency, 2009g). We have produced a separate assessment report on the generic site proposed by EDF and AREVA (Environment Agency 2010e).
- 13 This assessment does not cover radioactive discharges arising from decommissioning at the end of the reactor lifecycle.
- 14 The assessment aims to establish whether the design could be operated in the UK in line with UK Statute, policy and guidance on radioactive waste as currently written but it is recognised that the assessment should be kept under review to reflect changes in statute, policy and guidance that may occur between now and plant commissioning.

## 3 Assessment

- 15 This assessment considers the radiological impact of discharges from a UK EPR on members of the public. We have taken into account Statutory Guidance to the Environment Agency concerning the regulation of radioactive discharges into the Environment (DECC, 2009) which sets out principles for:
- a) regulatory justification of practices should be carried out by the Government;
  - b) optimisation of protection on the basis that radiological doses and risks to workers and members of the public from a source of exposure should be kept as low as reasonably achievable (the ALARA principle);
  - c) application of limits and conditions to control discharges from justified activities;
  - d) sustainable development;
  - e) the use of Best Available Techniques (BAT);
  - f) the precautionary principle;
  - g) the polluter pays principle;
  - h) the preferred use of 'concentrate and contain' in the management of radioactive waste over 'dilute and disperse' in cases where there would be a definite benefit in reducing environmental pollution, provided that BAT is being applied and worker dose is taken into account.

### 3.1 Assessment methodology

16 The basis of our assessment was to:

- a) consider the submission made by EDF and AREVA in particular the Pre-Construction Environmental Report (PCER) and its supporting documents;
- b) hold technical meetings with EDF and AREVA to clarify our understanding of the information presented and explain any concerns we had with that information;
- c) raise Regulatory Observations and Technical Queries where we believed information provided by EDF and AREVA was insufficient;
- d) assess the radiological impact of discharges from a UK EPR on members of the public to demonstrate that doses to members of the public from the UK EPR at the proposed site will be as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP) and not exceed dose constraints and limits;
- e) decide on any potential GDA Issues or other issues to carry forward from GDA.

17 EDF and AREVA provided their submission to GDA in August 2007. We carried out our initial assessment and concluded we needed additional information. We raised a Regulatory Issue on EDF and AREVA in February 2008 setting out the further information that we needed. EDF and AREVA completely revised their submission during 2008 and provided a Pre-Construction Environmental Report with supporting documents.

18 We assessed information contained in the Pre-Construction Environmental Report but found that while much improved from the original submission there were some areas where we required further information.

19 We raised 31 Technical Queries (TQs) on EDF and AREVA during our assessment. Two were relevant to this report:

- a) TQ-EPR-180 – Dose assessment assumptions – short -term releases. 27 May 2009.
- b) TQ-EPR-168 – Marine dispersion parameters for dose assessment. 27 May 2009.

20 EDF and AREVA responded to the TQs. They reviewed and updated the PCER in March 2010 to include all the relevant information provided by the RO and TQs. This report only uses and refers to the information contained in the updated PCER and its supporting documents.

### 3.2 Assessment objectives

21 Key areas of the submission made under the GDA arrangements by EDF and AREVA for the UK EPR design that have been considered are:

- a) Is the radiological impact assessment carried out by EDF and AREVA reasonable and justified?
- b) Can the radiological impact assessment carried out by EDF and AREVA be independently validated?
- c) Are predicted doses to members of the public below dose constraints and limits?



### 3.3 EDF and AREVA documentation

22 The Pre-Construction Environmental Report is divided into chapters and sub-chapters (provided as separate documents) and has supporting documents. We referred to the following documents to produce this report:

Document reference	Title	Version number
UKEPR-0003-011	PCER-Sub-chapter 1.1 - Introduction	03
UKEPR-0003-012	PCER – Sub-chapter 1.2 – General description of the unit	01
UKEPR-0003-090	PCER – Chapter 9 – Principles and methods used for environmental approach at the design stage	02
UKEPR-0003-100	PCER – Chapter 10 – Site environmental characteristics	03
UKEPR-0003-110	PCER – Chapter 11 – Radiological impact assessment	02

23 We use short references in this report, for example:

- a) PCER sub-chapter 6.2 section 1.2.1 = PCERsc6.2s1.2.1;
- b) BAT Demonstration section 3.2 = EPRBs3.2.

### 3.4 Summary of assessment findings

24 This report summarises the outcomes of our assessment of the information provided and the assessment carried out by EDF and AREVA with respect to prospective doses to members of the public as a result of the disposal of aqueous and gaseous radioactive waste from the UK EPR to the environment.

25 In order to assess potential impacts we required EDF and AREVA to carry out dose assessments as set out in section 2.7 of our Process and Information Document. In order to assess doses we also required EDF and AREVA to describe a generic site on which the dose assessment was based and which represented likely sites where a UK EPR might be located. A separate assessment report (Environment Agency, 2010e) has been prepared setting out our assessment of the generic site parameters provided by EDF and AREVA. For consistency the generic site description was also used in the assessment of potential impact on non-human species, see our assessment report (Environment Agency, 2010f).

26 In order to assess doses to members of the public, in addition to the description of the environmental features of the generic site, we required EDF and AREVA to provide information about discharges of aqueous and gaseous radioactive waste from the EPR and these are set out in our respective assessment reports (Environment Agency 2010c, d).

27 In order to verify and validate the dose assessment carried out by EDF and AREVA we appointed a contractor to comment on the assumptions made by EDF and AREVA with respect to dose assessment parameters, to repeat EDF and AREVA's dose assessment and provide a methodology by which we could calculate doses to members of the public at our proposed discharge limits (Environment Agency, 2010g).

28 During the dose assessments certain matters were identified and dealt with using the Regulatory Observation and Technical Query system.

- 29 Technical Query TQ-EPR-180 was raised on 27 May 2009 and required EDF and AREVA to provide information on certain parameters they had used in their short-term dose assessment. EDF and AREVA responded on 29 July 2009 and their response was taken into account by the contractor undertaking the validation and verification of EDF and AREVA's dose assessment.
- 30 Technical Query TQ-EPR-186 was raised on 27 May 2009 which required EDF and AREVA to justify certain marine dispersion parameters they had used in their dose assessment, in particular volumetric flow rate used in individual and collective dose assessments. EDF and AREVA responded on 14 July 2009 and their response was taken into account by the contractor undertaking the validation and verification of EDF and AREVA's dose assessment.
- 31 The outcomes of the dose assessment were compared with limits and constraints set out in Council Directive 96/29/Euratom, laying down basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionising radiation and enacted in England and Wales by the Radioactive Substances (Basic Safety Standards) (England and Wales) Direction 2000. The limits and constraints are:
- a) UK dose limit for members of the public: 1 mSv (1000  $\mu$ Sv) per annum individual effective dose.
  - b) UK dose constraints:
    - i) 300  $\mu$ Sv per year individual effective dose from a single new source, (in their 2009 publication '*Application of the 2007 Recommendations of the ICRP to the UK*' (HPA, 2009) the Health Protection Agency (HPA) has advised the UK Government to select a constraint value for members of the public for new power station that is less than 0.15 mSv (150  $\mu$ Sv) per year);
    - ii) 500  $\mu$ Sv per year individual effective dose from a single site not including exposures arising from direct radiation.
- 32 There are no regulatory limits and constraints for collective dose. Collective dose information is normally used for comparisons across sites or facilities. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) suggest that practices which give rise to collective doses less than 1 man Sv per year of operation may be exempted from regulatory control.
- 33 In their submission EDF and AREVA described a generic site and discharge data and using these they undertook a dose assessment to meet the requirements of our Process and Information Document. The dose assessment was provided to us in PCER Chapter 11 Radiological impact assessment.
- 34 In early 2009 we invited tenders from contractors using our framework contract to carry out a validation and verification exercise on EDF and AREVA's dose assessment and undertake an independent dose assessment of the UK EPR. The contract was let to Enviro Consulting Ltd. We consulted with HPA, Food Standards Agency (FSA) and the UK National Dose Assessment Working Group (NDAWG) on the contract specification prior to the tendering exercise and incorporated their comments in the final technical specification for the contract.
- 35 The aim of the independent assessment was to:
- a) Validate and verify the assumptions made by EDF and AREVA in their dose assessments.
  - b) Validate and verify the outcomes of the dose assessments carried out by EDF and AREVA.
  - c) Carry out independent dose assessments to demonstrate that the dose assessments carried out by EDF and AREVA were realistic.

- 36 We required the contractor to use PC CREAM to model dispersion and calculate doses to the reference group and collective doses for all exposure pathways including any unusual pathways. PC CREAM is a long recognised system for dose assessment developed for the EC.
- 37 We considered that:
- a) Site-specific habits data should be used where available however we recognised that at the generic stage the dose assessment would be carried out using parameters relating to the generic site provided by the EDF and AREVA.
  - b) In the absence of site-specific habits data generalised habits data from NRPB W41 should be used (NRPB, 2003). NRPB W41 gives generalised food intake rates, generalised inhalation and water intake rates, inadvertent ingestion rates, critical group ingestion rates of aquatic food, coastal, lakeside and river bank occupancy factors and indoor occupancy.
  - c) For site-specific dose assessments at sites where new facilities are close to existing nuclear facilities consideration needs to be given to doses which may arise as a result of discharges from the existing facilities bearing in mind the dose constraint of 500  $\mu\text{Sv}$  per year individual effective dose from a single site not including exposures arising from direct radiation.
  - d) In order to compare to the dose limit, significant future doses from historic discharges at the site or nearby sites and future direct radiation from other sites need to be added to future doses due to discharges and direct radiation from the site being assessed.
  - e) For assessments of individual dose, it is appropriate to take account of accumulation of radionuclides in the environment, usually by undertaking the assessment for the year in which the highest critical group dose is likely to occur. This ensures that future generations are afforded the same level of protection as the current generation. Assuming no change in discharge limits, the highest critical group dose is generally predicted to occur during the last few years of discharges from a plant / site. Once discharges cease or are reduced significantly, the highest environmental activity concentrations near the discharge point generally start to decline. An accumulation time-scale of 50 years is usually selected for new plants and for plants / sites where it is difficult to specify a closure date. Where radionuclides build-up to an equilibrium level more quickly in the environment, then a shorter time-scale may also be adopted. Generally, the highest radionuclide concentrations in the environment, from a given site, tend to decline following a reduction in discharges. A key exception is where there is in-growth of a daughter radionuclide from its parent (e.g. americium-241).
  - f) We noted that in their 2009 publication '*Application of the 2007 Recommendations of the ICRP to the UK*' (HPA, 2009) the HPA advised that the term 'reference group' should be gradually adopted to replace the term 'critical group' in order to ensure consistency with ICRP advice and terminology. In line with their advice we consider the terms 'critical group' and 'reference group' to be equivalent and to refer those individuals in the population of interest who receive or are expected to receive the highest dose. The report from Enviro Consulting Ltd (Environment Agency, 2010g) uses the term 'critical group' and this should be taken to mean the same as 'reference group'.
- 38 We required the contractor to undertake:
- a) Prospective assessment of doses from potential gaseous and aqueous discharges from the UK EPR design for the members of the public using information on potentially exposed members of the public set out by the EDF and AREVA for their generic site and taking account of direct radiation for comparison with the source dose constraint. Where applicable assessments should be carried out for 'normal

discharges', 'worst case discharges' and at any discharge limits proposed by the requesting party.

- b) Prospective assessments of:
  - i) annual dose to most exposed members of the public for liquid discharges;
  - ii) annual dose to most exposed members of the public for gaseous discharges;
  - iii) annual dose to the most exposed members of the public for all discharges from the facility;
  - iv) annual dose from direct shine radiation to the most exposed member of the public;
  - v) annual dose to the critical group for the facility;
  - vi) potential short-term doses based on the maximum anticipated short-term discharges from the facility in normal operation.

Information generated on peak concentrations of radionuclides in foods as part of the dose assessment should be identified for ready comparison with the Community Food Intervention Levels (EC, 1989).

- c) Assessment of the collective doses from gaseous and aqueous discharges from the UK EPR design for the populations identified by EDF and AREVA for their generic site. Where applicable assessments should be carried out for 'normal discharges', 'worst case discharges' and at any discharge limits proposed by the requesting party (RP).

39

In order to carry out the assessments we assessed the submission made by EDF and AREVA to ensure it provided the following data for their generic site:

- a) For atmospheric dispersion modelling and dose assessment:
  - i) Effective release height
  - ii) Volumetric flow rate
  - iii) Activity of each radionuclide in annual foreseeable discharges
  - iv) Location of receptors such as nearby residents, local food production sites, persons most exposed via inhalation of the plume, any free food sources
  - v) Meteorological data
  - vi) Surface roughness length
  - vii) Stability category
  - viii) Deposition velocity
  - ix) Washout coefficient
  - x) Terrestrial food consumption habits
- b) For marine dispersion modelling and dose assessment:
  - i) Activity of each radionuclide in annual foreseeable discharges
  - ii) Volumetric exchange rate for receiving water
  - iii) Location of discharge
  - iv) Consumption rates of locally caught seafood
  - v) Inhalation rates
  - vi) Beach occupancy rates
  - vii) Location of any receptors

40 The methodology and outcome of the work carried out by the contractor is set out in the report 'Generic design assessment, UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA, Assessment report - Independent Dose assessment' (IMAS/TR/2010/05) (Environment Agency, 2010g). Its outcome is summarised in the section below.

### 3.5 EDF and AREVA's dose assessment

41 In the EDF and AREVA submission, it is assumed that the UK EPR would be located on the coast. The annual maximum radioactive liquid and atmospheric discharges were used as the basis for assessing doses to the local population and collective doses. It should be noted that in their assessment EDF and AREVA used a value of 340 MBq for 'other radionuclides' discharged to the air despite proposing a discharge limit of 120 MBq. This was because they claimed they did not have time to repeat their dose assessment to reflect their revised proposed annual limits. For the same reason EDF and AREVA used a value of 900 GBq for carbon-14 to air despite proposing a discharge limit of 700 GBq. EDF and AREVA state the following in PCERsc11.1s1.1.1.e, "Since gaseous carbon-14 is the main contributor to the overall gaseous dose received from gaseous discharges, it is expected that the overall dose from gaseous discharge will be lower than discussed. Considering the low impact of fission and activation products on the total dose received, it is expected that the reduction of the annual limit for fission and activation products will not have a major impact on the overall dose calculation."

42 A tiered assessment approach was applied by EDF and AREVA to estimate doses to the local population. EDF and AREVA used the Environment Agency's initial radiological assessment approach followed by a more detailed and realistic assessment, using the PC CREAM 98 model. EDF and AREVA also provided estimates of the collective doses to the UK, European and World populations (truncated at 500 years), estimated using PC CREAM. They also predicted doses from expected short-term releases.

43 As part of the validation and verification activity the approaches applied by EDF and AREVA were reviewed and repeated.

44 **Doses from gaseous discharges** - Using the Stage 3 approach EDF and AREVA estimated the annual effective doses to the most exposed members of the local population, arising from the predicted annual maximum radioactive discharge to atmosphere, to be  $7.8 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  (to infants). It was possible to repeat the EDF and AREVA assessment outcome.

45 **Doses from aqueous discharges** - EDF and AREVA estimated doses from the maximum annual liquid radioactive discharges to the marine candidate critical group to be  $17 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  (to adult). It was possible to repeat the EDF and AREVA assessment outcome.

46 **Doses from direct radiation** - Exposure of the public from direct radiation from nuclear sites in the UK is the responsibility of the HSE. HSE require site operators to measure direct radiation at the site perimeter and estimate exposure to a reference group on an annual basis. EDF and AREVA have used direct radiation measurements for Sizewell B as a basis for their estimated direct radiation doses. Direct radiation doses were assessed as likely to be between  $1.7 - 4.8 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ , depending on the outdoor occupancy of the age of the group considered.

47 **Doses from short-term releases** – EDF and AREVA also assessed the impact of short duration releases to atmosphere at higher discharge rates as  $1.5 \mu\text{Sv}$  to an infant assuming one months discharges were released over 24 hours. It was not possible to reproduce this assessment to the level of detail used by EDF and AREVA.

48 **Doses to the representative person** – Dose to the representative person were then estimated by adding the doses to the most exposed group (adult) from atmospheric

and marine discharges and from direct radiation. This implies that this hypothetical person is assumed to be a member of the local fishing community who also resides at a distance of 500 m from the atmospheric discharge point, at which location he or she is exposed to direct radiation and inhalation pathways. Furthermore, they also consume two local terrestrial foods at high rates and other terrestrial foods at average rates. The highest total dose of 25.8  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  was predicted for an adult fisherman assumed to be living within 500 m of the site.

49 We conclude that all the doses assessed by EDF and AREVA are below the dose constraint for members of the public of 300  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  and the dose constraint recommended by the HPA for new build of 150  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ .

50 **Collective dose** – EDF and AREVA estimated the collective doses to the world population (truncated at 500 years) from representative atmospheric discharges to be of the order of 16 man Sv per year of discharge to atmosphere and 1.1 man Sv per year from representative liquid discharges. The highest dose per person was estimated to be 2 nSv  $\text{y}^{-1}$  to the UK population.

51 Other aspects of the submission, related to the assessment of the build up of material in the environment, were reviewed but not repeated.

52 The results of EDF and AREVA’s dose assessment are summarised below:

Dose to public from EDF and AREVA’s maximum discharges $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$					
Candidate Critical Group	Age Group	EPR Discharges			
		Stack 1	Marine	Direct Radiation	Total
CCG1 - local resident (high rate terrestrial food consumer)	Adult	4.0	1.9	4.8	10.7
	Child	4.4	1.2	2.5	8.1
	Infant	7.8	1.1	1.7	10.6
CCG2 - local fisherman (high marine exposure)	Adult	1.4	17	0	18.4
	Child	1.6	4.7	0	6.3
	Infant	2.3	1.5	0	3.8

**3.6 Our independent assessment of doses from maximum expected discharges**

53 An independent assessment of doses from discharges from the UK EPR design was also undertaken on our behalf by a contractor, Enviro Consulting Ltd. The assessment was based on information provided by EDF and AREVA and generic assumptions agreed with us. The following were assessed for gaseous and aqueous discharges:

- a) the annual dose to the critical group for the facility;
- b) the potential short-term doses from the maximum anticipated short-term discharges from normal operation;
- c) collective doses to the UK, European and World populations truncated at 500 years;
- d) doses from direct radiation.

54 **Doses from gaseous discharges** - The independent assessment predicted doses to members of the public from atmospheric discharges as 8.5  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  to an infant in the local resident family who consume locally produced terrestrial foods. The ingestion of

carbon-14 in milk accounts for the majority of the dose predicted from aerial discharges.

55 **Doses from aqueous discharges** - At the maximum liquid discharges, the highest dose to members of the public from marine discharges has been predicted to be around 28  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  to an adult fisherman. The dose arises primarily from carbon-14 in fish.

56 **Doses from direct radiation** - The dose from direct radiation was independently assessed by basing it on values measured for Sizewell B. The direct radiation dose to members of the public was estimated to be 4  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ . For the purposes of this assessment, this value has been assumed to apply to the UK EPR.

57 **Doses from short-term releases** – The estimated doses from short-term releases in the independent assessment (of the order of 5  $\mu\text{Sv}$  from a single occurrence) were significantly greater than those in the EDF and AREVA assessment (of 1.5  $\mu\text{Sv}$  from a single occurrence). This difference is a reflection of the greater level of simplification and conservatism implicit in the independent assessment of the contribution from terrestrial foods than in that undertaken by EDF and AREVA.

58 **Doses to the representative person** - The dose to the representative person from a UK EPR located at a generic coastal site taking account of contributions from gaseous and aqueous discharges and direct radiation, was estimated to be around 31  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  to local adult fishermen, of which 28  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  was due to aqueous discharges and 3  $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  was from gaseous discharges from the consumption of locally produced terrestrial foods and no contribution from direct radiation (as the representative person belongs to the group that is most exposed to liquid discharges and receives no dose from direct radiation).

59 **Collective dose** - The outcome of the independent assessment of collective doses was essentially equivalent to that presented in the EDF and AREVA submission.

60 The results of the independent assessment at EDF and AREVA’s maximum discharges are summarised below:

Dose to public from EDF and AREVA’s maximum discharges $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$					
Candidate Critical Group	Age Group	EPR Discharges			
		Stack 1	Marine	Direct Radiation	Total
CCG1 - local resident (high rate terrestrial food consumer)	Adult	5.30	2.01	4	11.31
	Child	5.73	1.13	4	10.85
	Infant	8.46	1.10	4	13.56
CCG2 - local fisherman (high marine exposure)	Adult	3.24	27.87	0	31.109
	Child	3.75	8.26	0	12.02
	Infant	4.14	2.74	0	6.88

61 The results from the independent assessment were slightly higher than those found by EDF and AREVA because, in the independent assessment, different assumptions about the characteristics of the local marine environment were applied and local residents were assumed to live closer to the site and to produce some vegetables and fruit closer to the site than in the EDF and AREVA assessment.

**3.7 Our independent assessment of doses from discharges at our proposed limits**

62 We used the spreadsheet prepared by Enviro Consulting Ltd to estimate doses at our proposed discharge limits. The discharges at the proposed limits are set out below:

Gaseous discharges at Environment Agency proposed limits		
Radionuclide	Atmospheric Discharges per Stack (TBq y <sup>-1</sup> )	
	Stack 1	Composition from PCER c11.1 table 2
Ar-41	6.53E-01	2.9% of noble gases limit of 22.5 TBq
C-14	7.00E-01	
Co-58	1.28E-05	25.5% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 50 MBq
Co-60	1.51E-05	30.1% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 50 MBq
Cs-134	1.17E-05	23.4% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 50 MBq
Cs-137	1.05E-05	21.0% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 50 MBq
H-3	3.00E+00	
I-131	1.82E-04	45.6% of proposed 'iodine radionuclides' limit of 400 MBq
I-133	2.18E-04	54.4.6% of proposed 'iodine radionuclides' limit of 400 MBq
Kr-85	3.13E+00	13.9% of noble gases limit of 22.5 TBq
Xe-131m	6.75E-02	0.3% of noble gases limit of 22.5 TBq
Xe-133	1.42E+01	63.1% of noble gases limit of 22.5 TBq
Xe-135	4.46E+00	19.8% of noble gases limit of 22.5 TBq



Aqueous Discharges at Environment Agency proposed limits		
Radionuclide	Aqueous Discharges (TBq y <sup>-1</sup> )	
	Discharge point 1	Composition from PCER c11.1 table 2
Ag-110m	2.85E-04	5.7% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
C-14	9.50E-02	
Co-58	1.04E-03	20.7% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Co-60	1.50E-03	30% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Cr-51	3.00E-05	0.6% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Cs-134	2.80E-04	5.6% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Cs-137	4.70E-04	9.45% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
H-3	7.50E+01	
I-131	5.00E-05	
Mn-54	1.35E-04	2.7% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Ni-63	4.80E-04	9.6% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Sb-124	2.45E-04	4.9% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Sb-125	4.07E-04	8.15% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq
Te-123m	1.30E-04	2.6% of 'other radionuclide' limit of 5 GBq

- 63 **Doses from gaseous discharges** – The highest doses from gaseous discharges was 3 µSv to an infant and the highest contribution was from carbon-14 in milk.
- 64 **Doses from aqueous discharges** – The highest doses from aqueous discharges was 28 µSv to an adult. The dose arises primarily from carbon-14 in fish.
- 65 **Doses from direct radiation** – The assessment of direct radiation was based on measured values for Sizewell B for 2007, for which a value of 4 µSv y<sup>-1</sup> has been published in Radioactivity in Food and the Environment 2007 (Environment Agency, 2008).
- 66 **Doses to the representative person** – Our Stage 3 assessment resulted in the highest estimated doses from an UK EPR is to the representative person of 30 µSv y<sup>-1</sup>. This assessment outcome is for our proposed annual limits on discharges for the UK EPR.

67 The results of the dose assessment at our proposed limits are summarised below:

Dose to the public at Environment Agency proposed limits $\mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$					
Candidate Critical Group	Age Group	UK EPR Discharges			
		Stack 1	Marine	Direct Radiation	Total
CCG1 - local resident (high rate terrestrial food consumer)	Adult	4.18	2.00	4	10.18
	Child	4.51	1.12	4	9.63
	Infant	6.71	1.09	4	11.80
CCG2 - local fisherman (high marine exposure)	Adult	2.56	27.76	0	30.38
	Child	2.96	8.22	0	11.18
	Infant	3.28	2.73	0	6.02

**3.8 Comparison to dose constraints and dose limits**

68 Source dose constraint (Defra, 2000) - The dose constraint for the maximum dose to people that may result from discharges from a new single source (for example, a new power station) is  $300 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  which applies to the dose from proposed discharges and direct radiation.

69 We conclude that sum of doses to the representative person at our proposed limits is below the source dose constraint, and below the dose constraint recommended by the HPA for new build of  $150 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ .

70 Site dose constraint - The dose constraint for the maximum dose to people that may result from discharges from a site as a whole is  $500 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  and it applies to the total dose from the discharges (direct radiation is not included) from all sources at a single location, including discharges from immediately adjacent sites.

71 A number of the sites listed in the draft Nuclear National Policy Statement as potentially suitable for a new nuclear power station are adjacent to existing nuclear power stations. In GDA the specific site at which a UK EPR might be located is not known but we consider, in the light of our assessment that the highest total dose is estimated to be  $31 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ , it is very unlikely that doses at the site will exceed the site dose constraint of  $500 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ . We consider that site dose should be assessed at the site-specific stage.

72 Dose limit - There is also a dose limit (Defra, 2000) for the maximum dose to any member of the public from ionising radiation. The dose limit is  $1 \text{ mSv y}^{-1}$  ( $1000 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ ) and it applies to the total dose from all artificial sources including past discharges but excluding medical and accidental exposure.

73 Comparison against the dose limit can only be done at site-specific permitting when contributions from all sources of radiation can be included.

## 4 Detailed findings

74 The assessment findings are set out in more detail in the independent dose assessment report prepared on our behalf by Enviro Consulting Ltd (Environment Agency, 2010g).

75 We consulted the Health Protection Agency and the Food Standards Agency on the draft and their comments, which were minor in nature, were incorporated into the final report.

## 5 Public comments

76 We did not receive any public comments during this assessment relating to the assessment of the radiological impact of discharges from the UK EPR on members of the public.

## 6 Conclusion

77 We conclude that all the doses assessed by EDF and AREVA are below the dose constraint for members of the public of  $300 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  and the dose constraint recommended by the HPA for new build of  $150 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ .

78 We conclude that sum of doses to the representative person at our proposed limits is below the source dose constraint.

79 A number of the sites listed in the Nuclear National Policy Statement as potentially suitable for a new nuclear power station are adjacent to existing nuclear power stations. In GDA the specific site at which a UK EPR might be located is not known but we consider in the light of our assessment that the highest total dose is estimated to be  $31 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$  it is very unlikely that doses at the site will exceed the site dose constraint of  $500 \mu\text{Sv y}^{-1}$ . We consider that site dose should be assessed at the site-specific stage.

80 Comparison against the dose limit can only be done at site-specific permitting when contributions from all sources of radiation can be included.

81 In line with our usual procedures we will require a detailed site-specific impact assessment to be carried out at site-specific permitting based on the actual environmental characteristics of the proposed site to demonstrate that doses to members of the public and non-human species from the UK EPR at the proposed site will be ALARP and below relevant dose constraint and dose limits.

## 7 Compliance with Environment Agency requirements

P&I Table 1 section or REP	Compliance comments
<p><b>Section 2.7</b> Prospective dose assessment for the generic site at the proposed limits for levels of discharge.</p>	<p>An assessment was carried out by EDF and AREVA which included an assessment of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• annual dose to most exposed members of the public for liquid discharges;</li> <li>• annual dose to most exposed members of the public for gaseous discharges (identifying separately the dose associated with on site incineration where applicable);</li> <li>• annual dose to the most exposed members of the public for all discharges from the facility;</li> <li>• annual dose from direct radiation to the most exposed member of the public;</li> <li>• annual dose to the critical group for the facility;</li> <li>• potential short-term doses, including via the food chain, based on the maximum anticipated short-term discharges from the facility in normal operation;</li> <li>• a comparison of the calculated doses with the relevant dose constraints;</li> <li>• an assessment of whether the build-up of radionuclides in the local environment of the facility, based on the anticipated lifetime discharges, might have the potential to prejudice legitimate users or uses of the land or sea.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Section 2.8 Collective dose assessments</b> for discharges from the facility truncated at 500 years to the UK, European and World populations.</p>	<p>An assessment of collective dose was made by EDF and AREVA.</p>
<p><b>Section 2.9 Sufficient assumed data</b> for others to be able to carry out all dose assessments.</p>	<p>Sufficient data was provided by EDF and AREVA and this allowed the independent validation and verification of their dose assessments.</p>
<p>SEDP1 General RSR Principle for siting new facilities - When evaluating sites for a new facility, account shall be taken of the factors that might affect the protection of people and the environment from radiological hazards and the generation of radioactive waste.</p>	<p>The generic site proposed by EDF and AREVA considered factors that might affect the protection of people and the environment. The information about the generic site used in the dose assessments seemed reasonable.</p>

P&I Table 1 section or REP	Compliance comments
<p>SEDP2 Movement of radioactive material in the environment - Data shall be provided to allow the assessment of rates and patterns of movement of radioactive materials in the air and the aquatic and terrestrial environments around sites.</p>	<p>Information on the potential movement of radioactive material in the environment was provided by EDF and AREVA.</p>
<p>SEDP3 Ambient radioactivity - Levels of ambient radioactivity around the sites of new facilities shall be assessed.</p>	<p>An assessment of potential doses from direct radiation from the EPR were made.</p>
<p>SEDP4 Multi-facility sites - In the case of nuclear and other sites on which there are already one or more facilities, the radiological impact of the whole site on people and the environment shall be assessed when considering the suitability of the site for any new facility.</p>	<p>This will be dealt with at the site-specific stage if the EPR is located on a multi-facility site.</p>
<p>RPDP1 Optimisation of protection - All exposures to ionising radiation of any member of the public and of the population as a whole shall be kept as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA), economic and social factors being taken into account</p>	<p>ALARP has been demonstrated at this stage however we require EDF and AREVA to keep ALARP matters under review.</p>
<p>RPDP2 Dose limits and constraints - Radiation doses to individual people shall be below the relevant dose limits and constraints.</p>	<p>Predicted doses to members of the public from the UK EPR at the generic site are less than the relevant dose limits and constraints.</p>
<p>RPDP4 Prospective dose assessments for radioactive discharges to the environment - Assessments of potential doses to people and to non-human species shall be made prior to granting any new or revised authorisation for the discharge of radioactive wastes into the environment.</p>	<p>A prior assessment has been made based on the generic site. We will require that prospective dose assessments are carried out at the site-specific stage as part of the permitting process and using information specific to the site in question.</p>

P&I Table 1 section or REP	Compliance comments
<p>UK dose limit for members of the public - 1 mSv per annum individual effective dose.</p>	<p>Individual doses predicted from the EDF and AREVA assessment and from the independent assessment were below the UK dose limit for members of the public. We will require that prospective dose assessments are carried out at the site-specific stage as part of the permitting process and using information specific to the site in question.</p>
<p>UK dose constraints -300 <math>\mu</math>Sv per annum individual effective dose from a single new source, (in their 2009 publication Application of the 2007 Recommendations of the ICRP to the UK (HPA, 2009) the Health Protection Agency has advised the UK Government to select a constraint value for members of the public for new power station that is less than 0.15 mSv per year).</p>	<p>Individual doses predicted from the EDF and AREVA assessment and from the independent assessment were below the dose constraint of 300 <math>\mu</math>Sv <math>y^{-1}</math> and the proposed constraint for new power stations of 150 <math>\mu</math>Sv <math>y^{-1}</math>. We will require that prospective dose assessments are carried out at the site-specific stage as part of the permitting process and using information specific to the site in question.</p>
<p>UK dose constraints -500 <math>\mu</math>Sv per annum individual effective dose from a single site not including exposures arising from direct radiation.</p>	<p>Individual doses predicted from the EDF and AREVA assessment and from the independent assessment were below the dose constraint of 500 <math>\mu</math>Sv <math>y^{-1}</math> from a single site assuming the EPR is not on a multi-facility site. We will require that prospective dose assessments are carried out at the site-specific stage as part of the permitting process and using information specific to the site in question.</p>
<p>IAEA suggest that practices which give rise to collective doses less than 1 man Sv per year of operation may be exempted from regulatory control.</p>	<p>Collective doses predicted from the independent assessment are greater than 1 man Sv per year of operation. The practice will not be exempted from regulatory control.</p>

## References

- (DECC 2009) Statutory Guidance to the Environment Agency concerning the regulation of radioactive discharges into the environment, Department of Energy and Climate Change and Welsh Assembly Government, 2009.  
[http://www.decc.gov.uk/media/viewfile.ashx?filepath=what%20we%20do/uk%20energy%20supply/energy%20mix/nuclear/radioactivity/dischargesofradioactivity/1\\_20091202160019\\_e\\_@@\\_guidanceearradioactivedischarges.pdf&filetype=4](http://www.decc.gov.uk/media/viewfile.ashx?filepath=what%20we%20do/uk%20energy%20supply/energy%20mix/nuclear/radioactivity/dischargesofradioactivity/1_20091202160019_e_@@_guidanceearradioactivedischarges.pdf&filetype=4)
- (Defra, 2000) The Radioactive Substances (Basic Safety Standards) (England and Wales) Direction 2000, Defra, May 2000.  
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/radioactivity/government/legislation/pdf/rsd2000.pdf>
- (EC,1989) Council Regulation (Euratom) No. 3954/87 laying down the maximum permitted levels of radioactive contamination of foodstuffs and feeding stuffs following a nuclear accident or other case of radiological emergency. Commission of the European Communities [1989] *Official Journal of the European Communities*, L371, Volume 11, 1987; amended by Council Regulation 2218/89 *Official Journal of the European Communities*, L211, Volume 1, 1989.
- (Environment Agency, 2006) Initial Radiological Assessment Methodology (Parts 1 and 2) Science Report SC030162/SR1  
<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/SCHO0106BKDT-e-e.pdf>
- (Environment Agency, 2007) Process and Information Document for Generic Assessment of Candidate Nuclear Power Plant Designs, Environment Agency, Jan 2007.  
<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0107BLTN-e-e.pdf>
- (Environment Agency, et al 2008) Radioactivity in Food and the Environment, 2007 (RIFE – 13), Environment Agency, Food Standards Agency, Northern Ireland Environment Agency and Scottish Environment Protection Agency, 2008.
- (Environment Agency, et al 2009) Radioactivity in Food and the Environment, 2008 (RIFE – 14), Environment Agency, Food Standards Agency, Northern Ireland Environment Agency and Scottish Environment Protection Agency, 2009.
- (Environment Agency, 2010a). Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Consultation Document.
- (Environment Agency, 2010b) RGS, No RGN RSR 1: Regulatory Environmental Principles (REPs), 2010  
<http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEHO0709BQSB-e-e.pdf>
- (Environment Agency, 2010c). EAGDAR EPR1000-04 Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Assessment report – Gaseous radioactive waste disposal and limits
- (Environment Agency, 2010d). EAGDAR EPR 1000-05 Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Assessment report – Aqueous radioactive waste disposal and limits

- (Environment Agency, 2010e). EAGDAR EPR 1000-10 Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Assessment report – Generic site
- (Environment Agency, 2010f). EAGDAR EPR 1000-12: Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Assessment report – Radiological impact on non-human species.
- (Environment Agency, 2010g). EAGDAR EPR1000-14: Generic design assessment. UK EPR nuclear power plant design by AREVA NP SAS and Electricité de France SA. Assessment report – Independent Dose Assessment.
- (HPA, 2005) Ionising Radiation Exposure of the UK Population – 2005 Review (HPA-RPD-001), Health Protection Agency, May 2005.  
[http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb\\_C/1194947389360](http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1194947389360)
- (HPA, 2009) Application of the 2007 ICRP Recommendations to the UK – Advice from the Health Protection Agency, RCE-12, July 2009  
[http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb\\_C/1246519364845](http://www.hpa.org.uk/web/HPAwebFile/HPAweb_C/1246519364845)
- (NRPB, 2003) Generalised Habit Data for Radiological Assessments, NRPB W41, National Radiological Protection Board, 2003



## Abbreviations

ALARA	As low as reasonably achievable
ALARP	As low as reasonable practicable
BAT	Best available techniques
EPR 10	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010
EPRB	GDA UK EPR – BAT demonstration, document UKEPR-0011-001
EPRB 3.5s1.2	EPRB form 3.3 section 1.2 (example reference)
FSA	Food Standards Agency
GDA	Generic design assessment
HPA	Health Protection Agency
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
IWS	GDA UK EPR – Integrated Waste Strategy Document UKEPR-0010-001 Issue 00
JPO	Joint Programme Office
NDAWG	UK National Dose Assessment Working Group
NRPB	National Radiological Protection Board (now part of Health Protection Agency)
P&ID	Process and information document
PCER	Pre-Construction Environmental Report
PCERsc3.3s4.1	PCER sub-chapter 3.3 section 4.1 (example reference)
PCSR	Pre-Construction Safety Report
REPs	Radioactive substances environmental principles
RGN	Regulatory Guidance Note
RGS	Regulatory Guidance Series
RI	Regulatory Issue
RO	Regulatory Observation
RP	Requesting Party
RSA 93	Radioactive Substances Act 1993
RWMD	Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (of NDA)
TQ	Technical Query





**Would you like to find out more about us, or about your environment?**

**Then call us on**

**08708 506 506\*** (Mon-Fri 8-6)

**email**

**enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk**

**or visit our website**

**[www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)**

**incident hotline 0800 80 70 60** (24hrs)

**floodline 0845 988 1188**

**\*Approximate calls costs: 8p plus 6p per minute (standard landline).  
Please note charges will vary across telephone providers**



**Environment first: This publication is printed on paper made from 100 per cent previously used waste. By-products from making the pulp and paper are used for composting and fertiliser, for making cement and for generating energy.**