

# Environment Agency Permitting Decision: RSR Permits

## Applicant Name

Magnox Limited

## Reference Number

EPR/ZP3493SQ/V005

## Record of decision

We have previously advertised the application. We have also consulted on a draft decision and draft permit. We have assessed the application, considered the responses received and have made a decision to grant the application subject to the conditions in the [varied] permit

The decision is effective from 14 March 2017.

We consider in reaching this decision we have taken into account all relevant considerations and legal requirements, and that the permit will ensure the appropriate level of protection of people and the environment.

These considerations are set out in

- DECC RSR Guidance
- RGN RSR1 RSR Environmental principles
- RGN RSR2 The regulation of radioactive substances activities on nuclear licensed sites
- and the documents referenced from those documents

## Purpose of this document

This decision document sets out the reasons for our decision.

## Glossary of terms used in this document

Term	Meaning
ADAP	Active Discharge Abatement Plant: A facility operating at Bradwell site whose purpose is to treat radioactive liquid waste from the Fuel Element Debris Dissolution plant in order to render it suitable to discharge into the environment.
ALARA	As Low as Reasonably Achievable (economic and social factors being taken into account). Radiation doses comply with ALARA when they have been reduced to a level that represents a balance between dose and other factors (including economics). This is a statement of the optimisation principle.
BAT	Best Available Techniques - the latest stage of development (state of the art) of processes, of facilities or of methods of operation which indicate the practical suitability of a particular measure for limiting discharges, emissions and waste. In determining whether a set of processes, facilities and methods of operation constitute the best available techniques in general or individual cases, special consideration shall be given to:  a) comparable processes, facilities or methods of operation which have recently been successfully tried out; b) technological advances and changes in scientific knowledge and understanding; c) the economic feasibility of such techniques; d) time limits for installation in both new and existing plants; e) the nature and volume of the discharges and emissions concerned.
Care and Maintenance	A period of quiescence in which a nuclear site is kept in a passively safe and secure state, requiring minimal inspection and maintenance, for a great number of years
EPR	Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010
FED	Fuel Element Debris: A general term used to describe the material produced from the process whereby the protective cladding from the spent uranium fuel, historically used to power Magnox reactors, is removed.
FSA	Food Standards Agency.
Justification	The benefits and detriments of any practice which could result in exposure to ionising radiation must be assessed prior to the practice being permitted. If the benefits outweigh the detriments, the practice is justified.
OSPAR	Oslo and Paris Convention for the protection of the marine environment in the north-east Atlantic. The UK is a signatory to this Convention, whose strategies aim to prevent pollution of the maritime environment by continuously reducing discharges, emissions and losses of chemically hazardous substances and radioactive substances.
RSR	Radioactive Substances Regulation, which is part of the Environmental Permitting Regulations
Water Discharge permit	A permit issued by the Environment Agency under the EPR. Water Discharge permits are required for specified activities, including for the discharge of non-radioactive sewage or effluents from industrial processes to watercourses, estuaries or to the sea.

## **Part 1 Permits and variations for the accumulation and disposal of radioactive waste.**

### **Introduction describing the application.**

This application concerns a request from Magnox Limited (Magnox), the permit holder, to allow modifications to the discharge system, which include two replacement radioactive aqueous waste discharge pipelines that have been constructed within the existing outfall structure. Therefore, the discharges will still be made to the Blackwater Estuary at the same place. The new discharge system has been designed so that it is more suitable for the management of low volumes of radioactive liquid waste arising from the on-going decommissioning activities at Bradwell Site. This system will no longer require abstractions to be made from the Estuary to ensure the effluent is effectively discharged as required by the existing discharge system. These arrangements will replace the current arrangements for discharge through the two existing radioactive waste discharge points currently authorised under environmental permit EPR/ZP3493SQ. If the new routes are permitted, Magnox will be able to switch over to the new systems, at the point it is no longer able to continue using the existing discharge system and this will no longer be used for making discharges.

Magnox also requested minor administrative changes to the permit to combine a number of approved gaseous radioactive waste discharge outlets and to remove other gaseous waste outlets that are now redundant.

The replacement discharge system comprises two new discharge pipelines for radioactive aqueous waste that have been installed by Magnox to take effluent directly from the Final Monitoring and Delay Tank (FMDT) and the Main Drains Pit, to allow discharge directly to the Blackwater Estuary. The current system is routed through the East Cooling Water Outfall. Utilising this route requires the pumping of the effluent via the Alternative Effluent Pumping System (AEPS). Magnox wishes to remove these pumps as part of its aim to minimise the complexity of discharge systems and reduce the frequency of maintenance activities.

However, the movement of silt in the Blackwater Estuary has been observed by Magnox to be impacting upon the inlet and outlet culverts, which allow the flow of water to aid dispersion of effluent from the Final Monitoring and Delay Tank and Main Drains Pit. Magnox is concerned that one or both of the culverts will become blocked prior to the site's entry into Care and Maintenance.

The use of the two additional discharge lines, which have already been installed, will therefore allow Magnox to maintain capability to discharge radioactive aqueous waste in the event that the existing discharge lines become blocked.

The changes requested to the gaseous radioactive waste discharge routes reflect the ongoing decommissioning of the Bradwell site and the associated de-planting or demolition of some facilities. This has resulted in a number of outlets being either no longer present or no longer used. Magnox has therefore applied to remove a number of redundant gaseous waste outlets and to combine a number of existing approved outlets under the permit.

## **Justification and Euratom Article 37 (RSR Part A Q9, RSR Part B3 Q2b)**

The practice is justified as 3. *Generation of electricity by nuclear reactors*<sup>1</sup>.

An Article 37 submission is not required for this application.

### **Consultation**

Magnox has not applied to increase the amount of radioactivity that it is authorised to discharge from Bradwell Site. We consider this application to be for a minor change to the RSR permit. We do not normally consult formally on either the application or our decision for such minor changes.

However, in this case, we notified individuals and groups who we thought might be interested that we had received a request from Magnox for changes to be made to the RSR permit (applications for variation).

Annex 1 summarises the comments we received and how we have taken these into account in reaching our decision.

Due to the volume of representations we received in relation to the advertising of Magnox's application we decided that we would undertake a consultation on the draft permit and our 'minded to' decision to grant the application from Magnox.

Annex 2 summarises the representations we received and how we have considered these in reaching our decision to grant Magnox's application to vary the RSR permit at Bradwell Site.

We also separately consulted on both the applications and draft decisions in relation to parallel applications from Magnox for changes to the permits covering the non-radioactive properties of the liquid discharges.

We have considered the representations received from members of the public and interested parties insofar as these are relevant to our decision for the RSR permit.

### **Operator and Operator competence (RSR Part A Q10)**

We are satisfied that the applicant is the person who will have control over the operation of the facility after the grant of the permit. We have assessed the applicant's competence against the guidance on management arrangements. We have not identified any reasons indicating that Magnox is unable to operate in accordance with the permit.

<sup>1</sup>See Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) guidance on the application and administration of the Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiation Regulations 2004, Annex 2.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/432763/JoPIIRR\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/432763/JoPIIRR_guidance.pdf)

## **Disposal of Radioactive Waste, disposal routes and limits (RSR Part B3, Q3, 4a, 4b)**

Our document "Criteria for setting limits on the discharge of radioactive waste from nuclear sites" details our methodology for setting limits.

### **Gaseous Waste**

We have considered the proposals in relation to the changes to the radioactive gaseous waste discharge outlets. We have made changes to the specified gaseous discharge outlets listed in the permit to allow more effective and efficient reporting of discharges of radioactive gaseous waste to the environment.

There are no changes to the limits on gaseous radioactive waste in the permit and there will not be any changes to the gaseous discharge profile for the site as a result of these administrative changes.

### **Aqueous Waste**

Criteria for setting limits have not been reviewed as part of the proposals in relation to the changes to the radioactive aqueous waste discharge route. We have not changed any limits or notification levels for the radioactive aqueous waste discharge outlets. Magnox is still required to ensure that the Best Available Techniques (BAT) are used at the site to ensure that the generation of radioactive waste is minimised; the impact of the discharges is suitably mitigated; and to ensure that there are adequate arrangements to monitor discharges and to demonstrate that radioactive waste disposals are in line with regulatory and Government Policy requirements.

We considered information supplied by Magnox in support of its application to demonstrate how the proposed changes to the radioactive aqueous waste discharge arrangements represent BAT (Reference 2 and Reference 6).

In particular, the BAT report (Reference 6) highlighted several issues with maintaining the existing discharge route, including: risks from de-silting operations on native oyster populations; operational restrictions on de-silting operations; costs and hazards arising from de-silting operations; and the likelihood of their success.

We are satisfied that the proposed changes to the aqueous waste discharge management arrangements will not give rise to any unacceptable environmental impacts and will allow Magnox to continue to apply BAT to minimise the radioactivity in the discharges, in accordance with the requirements of the permit.

We are equally satisfied that both the current and the proposed arrangements for the management and control of radioactive aqueous waste discharges are compatible with the requirement to apply BAT.

### **Specified solid waste transfers to other premises**

Magnox's application does not include any proposals to the way that solid waste is managed at the site, nor to the specified disposal routes. These remain subject to the application of BAT to ensure the minimisation of the creation of waste, including the activity in the waste and the volume of waste generated. We have not considered this as part of our decision.

### **Monitoring (RSR Part B3 Q5)**

Magnox is not proposing to alter its existing arrangements for monitoring discharges of gaseous and aqueous radioactive waste.

However, Magnox has proposed adding new radiological environmental monitoring to its programme around Bradwell Site when it uses the new discharge system for radioactive aqueous waste. This will involve additional weekly sampling of silt from a location near to the outfall pipe for the discharge lines for a period of 3-6 months to validate its modelling of the dispersion characteristics of the new discharge system.

We are satisfied that Magnox's environmental monitoring programme represents BAT and remains consistent with the joint Technical Guidance Note 2 on [Environmental Radiological Monitoring](#) (Reference 16).

In addition to Magnox's environmental monitoring programme we, along with the Food Standards Agency (FSA), carry out independent environmental monitoring around Bradwell Site. This information is made available to the public by the annual Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) Report (References 14 and 24). We also make this information available to the public and interested parties through a web portal.

### **Radiological Assessment (RSR Part B3 Q6)**

Magnox has assessed the potential impact of radioactive aqueous waste discharges to the most exposed members of the public (Reference 6). The identified potential impact over a year remains the same whether discharges are made from the old or from the new discharge system.

In addition, Magnox considered the potential impact to a swimmer/water user in the Blackwater Estuary during the period of a discharge.

Magnox's assessment indicated that the potential radiological impact remained below the legal dose limit and relevant dose constraint for members of the public.

Magnox's proposed changes to the radioactive aqueous waste discharge system at Bradwell Site will result in reduced dilution of the radioactive aqueous waste prior to it being discharged. When we originally granted the permit, we carried out an independent assessment of the potential impact of radioactive liquid waste discharges to the most exposed members of the public. Our original assessment did not assume dilution of the effluent, either prior to or at the point of discharge and therefore remains valid for our determination of this application.

Our assessments include consideration of the potential impact on non-human species. The assessments indicate that these potential impacts remain well below the relevant levels of radiological significance agreed internationally and so remain valid.

We have taken account of the conservation advice provided by Natural England in relation to delivery of the conservation objectives for the Blackwater Estuary Marine Conservation Zone (Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne Estuaries Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) – Supplementary Advice on Conserving and Restoring Site Features) (reference 17) and are satisfied that this application is consistent with the advice received.

We are satisfied also that there remains no significant adverse impact on a European Site; Site of Special Scientific Interest; Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty or other conservation site.

## **Receipt of waste (RSR Part B3 Q7)**

No new considerations for this application.

## **Non-radiological issues**

The changes Magnox has requested to their arrangements for management of aqueous radioactive waste discharges are also subject to changes being made to the EPR permits covering the non-radiological properties of the liquid discharge (Water Discharge Permits). These changes have been considered separately, in parallel. Although the permitting decisions are separate, Magnox will only be able to change its arrangements for managing the liquid discharges if all the permits allow this. Therefore, we have reached our decision in conjunction with colleagues considering changes to the other permits. For simplicity and transparency we have also provided joint updates to interested parties, and we made our draft decisions available for comment at the same time.

## **Other-including any special points considered.**

We acknowledge that a significant number of representations have been received during the consultations on both the separate applications from Magnox and on our draft decisions to vary the non-RSR environmental permits relating to the discharge of treated effluent from FED dissolution at Bradwell Site. A number of these representations expressed concern in relation to the disposal of radioactive waste and included a number of specific questions. Insofar as these are relevant, we have considered these points in reaching our draft decision and we have summarised this in Annex 1 and Annex 2.

Our Operational Instruction 247\_10 sets out our process for determining environmental permit applications for radioactive substances activities on nuclear sites and sets out the expectations on us during consultation on permit applications.

As a result of this application we have implemented some minor changes to the permit to reflect minor modifications to the standard permit conditions for nuclear licensed sites.

## **Decision**

**We conclude that that Magnox Limited can operate in accordance with the permit conditions to meet statutory requirements and the requirements of Government policy. We therefore grant the application, subject to the conditions of the permit.**

## Annex 1: Summary of representations received on the application

When we advertised the applications for the Water Discharge permits variation applications (references: EPR/DP3127XB/V002 and PR2TSE10760/V003), we took the opportunity to notify interested parties that we had received an application for variation of the RSR permit at Bradwell Site.

We received a significant number of representations in relation to the requested variations to the Water Discharge permits. A small number of the comments we received related to matters also relevant to radioactive waste discharges and the impact of these discharges on the environment. Due to the high level of public interest in the permit applications we decided to consult the public on our draft decision and draft permit for the RSR permit variation application as well.

We have summarised in this annex how we have taken the responses into account in reaching our decision. Copies of all consultation responses have been placed on the Environment Agency public register, except where the person making the response asked for these not to be made public.

We received 44 responses. These are summarised below, together with our consideration of them.

<b>Topic: Optimisation in the management and disposal of radioactive waste</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>A number of respondents have expressed the view that the operational performance of the FED treatment plant at Bradwell Site has been sub-optimal and/or that the treatment of FED at Bradwell Site does not represent BAT.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR5, PR5a, PR7, PR9, PR10, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR19, PR21, PR22, PR25, PR26, PR29, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38 PR39, PR40, PR41, PR42, PR44</p>	<p>In 2006 Magnox identified that its preferred approach for the management of FED at Bradwell Site was to treat it on-site by a process of dissolution and abatement to remove radioactivity from the discharge.</p> <p>In 2011 Magnox applied to us for changes to its RSR permit to allow them to carry out the FED treatment process. As part of our determination we considered the technical justification provided by the operator and accepted that Magnox's decision for the treatment of FED could be pursued provided Magnox applied BAT to minimise the levels of radioactivity in the discharges and ensure that the radiological impact to members of the public was kept ALARA.</p> <p>The application included a request to increase the limits for gaseous discharges for H-3 and C-14. Therefore, in accordance with Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty, on 12 March 2012 the UK Government submitted a modified plan for the disposal of radioactive waste arising from the decommissioning of the Bradwell Site, including general data on the radiological impact to members of the public in other European member states from discharges associated with the FED treatment. We only granted the permit, in June 2012, after the European Commission had provided its opinion that the planned modification would not give rise to doses to the population in another Member State that would be significant from the point of view of health.</p> <p>The current changes requested by Magnox do not include any requests to change the nature or magnitude of their discharges (i.e. the limits in the permit). Hence, our original assessments</p>



	<p>of potential environmental impacts from discharges remain valid (see also comments under 'Radiological Assessment: Impact on non-human species and our conservation duties').</p> <p>It took Magnox longer than originally anticipated to bring the FED treatment plant on line and the treatment of FED at site did not start until June 2014.</p> <p>Magnox has had operational difficulties with the FED treatment plant and has not been able to achieve the desired level of throughput. However, the environmental performance of the FED treatment process (abatement to reduce the levels of radioactivity in the discharge) has remained consistent with our regulatory expectations. We are satisfied that the treatment of FED is compatible with the requirement to apply BAT to ensure that radioactivity in the discharges is kept ALARA. The levels of radioactivity in the discharges remain well within the limits set in the environmental permit (less than 1% of the annual limits). This does not mean an alternative approach could not equally be demonstrated to be compatible with the requirement to apply BAT. We recognise that a number of other possible approaches to the management of the FED waste could be equally acceptable from an environmental perspective.</p>
<p>Some respondents have stated their opposition to any proposals that might be made for the future importation of FED from other nuclear sites for dissolution at Bradwell Site.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR9, PR10, PR13, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR19, PR25, PR26, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38, PR39</p>	<p>It is a requirement of the environmental permit that transfers of radioactive waste between sites can only be made via an optimised disposal route. In addition, the possible future importation of FED to Bradwell Site from other nuclear sites might require planning approval.</p> <p>The conditions of the RSR permit do not prevent Magnox from disposing of FED that has come from other nuclear sites at Bradwell Site.</p> <p>We are not aware of any such proposals from Magnox and do not see this as a likely priority for Magnox in the future, as this would further extend the Bradwell decommissioning programme and delay the site's entry to Care and Maintenance.</p> <p>However, if Magnox's plans were to change we would consider such proposals on the basis of the evidence that would be needed in order to demonstrate that this disposal route is optimised.</p>

Some respondents suggested that Magnox should consider alternative ways of dealing with the discharges from the FED treatment process, such as the use of settlement tanks prior to discharge, or the transport, by boat, and subsequent discharge of the treated FED effluent in the open sea.

**Raised by:** PR3, PR9, PR10, PR13, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR21, PR25, PR26, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38, PR39, PR44

**Use of settlement tanks:**

The FED dissolution process, including treatment of the effluent in the ADAP, involves the use of fine and micro-filtration to remove un-dissolved particles, as well as ion-exchange to remove specific dissolved radionuclides from the aqueous waste.

Magnox checks the turbidity of the effluent against specified operational environmental performance criteria. Turbidity levels are measured pre and post discharge from the Final Monitoring and Delay Tank to confirm compliance with the RSR permit condition to use BAT to exclude entrained solids.

Turbidity results for discharges from the Bradwell Final Monitoring and Delay Tank, covering the period 12 April to 21 October 2015, were provided to us by Magnox (Reference 13). The results showed that the turbidity levels are typically below 1 Nephelometric Turbidity Unit (NTU), with the highest value being 3 NTU. The Bradwell Site environmental performance criterion for turbidity in routine discharges from the Final Monitoring and Delay Tank is <10 NTU.

For comparison: UK Drinking Water standards prescribe a maximum value for turbidity of 4 NTU.

Turbidity levels of discharges from the Final Monitoring and Delay Tank at Bradwell Site are therefore comparable to drinking water.

The operation of settlement tanks prior to discharge would serve to allow heavier particles to settle to the bottom of the tank. However, such particles would have already been removed via the filtration process at ADAP.

We do not think any additional measures to further remove suspended solids from the liquid discharges are required, at this stage, to exclude entrained solids from the discharge as the current process demonstrates that BAT is achieved.

**Transport of FED effluent by boat for subsequent discharge to the open sea:**

The transfer of radioactive liquid waste for disposal at sea is not likely to be consistent with UK Government's radioactive waste discharge strategy and is likely to be in contravention of international agreements – e.g. OSPAR.

From an environmental impact perspective it is also unlikely that any reduction to localised radiological impact would be offset by the wider environmental impacts associated with transportation. In addition, such an approach is likely to be unreasonable, in terms of the associated implications for worker health and safety; highly resource intensive; expensive; and impractical.

We have not considered this suggestion further.

<p>A number of representations have been made concerning the fact that the new discharge system proposed for use at the site for the disposal of radioactive aqueous waste will not provide the comparable level of initial dilution of the waste that is afforded by the existing aqueous waste discharge system.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR1, PR2, PR3, PR6, PR7, PR9, PR10, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR21, PR25, PR26, PR29, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38, PR39, PR43, PR44</p>	<p>We have considered the proposals to utilise the new discharge route for radioactive aqueous waste, specifically noting that this route will provide a reduced level of initial dilution to the liquid waste in comparison to the existing discharge system.</p> <p>In particular, the BAT report from Magnox (Reference 6) highlighted several issues with maintaining the existing discharge route, including: risks from de-silting operations on native oyster populations; operational restrictions on de-silting operations; costs and hazards arising from de-silting operations; and the likelihood of their success.</p> <p>Even though the proposed discharge system does not provide the same level of dispersion, the environmental impact of these changes will be localised, and for a short time immediately following the discharge. We do not consider these changes to be environmentally significant and also that there are additional environmental benefits to using the new discharge system.</p> <p>We are satisfied that the proposed changes to the aqueous waste discharge management arrangements continue to represent BAT with respect to the radioactivity in the discharges.</p> <p>We are equally satisfied that either the current or the proposed arrangements for the management and control of radioactive liquid effluent discharge could each be considered compatible with the requirement to apply BAT.</p>
--	--

<b>Topic: Radiological Assessment: Comparison with constraints and limits</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Some respondents raised concerns that the ongoing discharges of radioactive waste from the site pose a risk of harm to people.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR14, PR20, PR23, PR28 PR41, PR44</p>	<p>We have carried out detailed assessments of the potential radiological impact of discharges made from Bradwell Site, including the potential impact to public health.</p> <p>The most recent assessment of the potential impact to members of the public was published in the Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) report 2014 (Reference 14). This indicates the radiological impact was less than 5 microsieverts, which corresponds to less than 0.5% of the relevant dose limit for members of the public (or less than 0.2% of the average dose to members of the UK population from all sources of radiation).</p> <p>In practice, discharges from Bradwell Site are significantly below the limits set in the permit. Even if discharges were made at the maximum level allowed by the permit, our assessments indicate the potential radiological impact would be well below the relevant dose limit for members of the public.</p>

<b>Topic: Radiological Assessment: Impact on non-human species and our conservation duties</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Some respondents raised concerns that the application fails to adequately consider the impact of the liquid radioactive waste discharges on the Blackwater Estuary Marine Conservation Zone.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR9, PR10, PR14, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR19, PR20, PR23 PR21, PR22, PR25, PR26, PR28 PR29, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38 , PR39, PR41, PR43, PR44</p>	<p>We have undertaken detailed radiological assessments, which include looking at the potential impact of discharges from Bradwell Site on plant and animal life in the Blackwater Estuary.</p> <p>The Blackwater Estuary holds a number of designations due to its important ecological value. These include designations as a Special Protection Area (SPA), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Ramsar site, as well as a more recent designation as a Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ).</p> <p>We have assessed the potential radiological impact to the environment on the basis of radioactive discharges being made at the levels of the limits in the permit. On this basis, the predicted that dose rates to marine and terrestrial plant and animal life were still below the value where we are satisfied there will be no adverse effect on non-human species. The limits in the permit are not being changed so the assessments remain valid for the proposed changes to the liquid discharge system.</p> <p>We have taken account of the recent designation of the area as an MCZ. We remain satisfied that the radioactive discharges made in accordance with the requirements of the environmental permit will not compromise the identified conservation objectives.</p>
<p>Some respondents thought that a new radiological assessment should be done for this application due to the fact that the proposed system of discharging radioactive liquid waste from the site no longer involves the pre-dilution of the waste prior to it being discharged to the Blackwater Estuary.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR9, PR10, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR21, PR25, PR26, PR29, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38, PR39, PR44</p>	<p>Our radiological assessment did not take into account the pre-dilution of the discharge when screening the potential impact on the environment. The screening assessment provides reassurance that even if discharges were made at the level of the limits in the permit they will not cause unacceptable environmental consequences. Our assessment therefore remains valid for the proposed changes to the liquid discharge system.</p> <p>The modelling studies provided by Magnox show that the effect of the reduced dilution provided by the new discharge system for radioactive aqueous waste compared with the existing discharge system is only likely to cause a short term localised increase to the levels of radioactivity in the environment.</p>

**Topic: Environmental Monitoring**

<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>We received queries concerning the regulatory programme of environmental monitoring that is undertaken around Bradwell Site, including the scope and coverage of the programme and the availability of the data.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR6, PR9</p>	<p>Environmental monitoring around Bradwell Site is undertaken separately by Magnox and the relevant regulatory authorities (i.e. the Environment Agency and the FSA).</p> <p>The results of Magnox's environmental monitoring programme are required to be submitted to us under Bradwell Site's RSR permit. This information is used by Magnox to assess the annual retrospective dose received by members of the public. It is also a requirement under the site's environmental permit to provide this information to us.</p> <p>This information is available to the public.</p> <p>A separate independent programme of environmental monitoring around Bradwell Site is also carried out for the Environment Agency and the FSA.</p> <p>The results of this independent monitoring programme are included in the RIFE report, which is published annually.</p> <p>The 2014 RIFE report was published on 28 October 2015 (Reference 14). The 2014 report covers the January to December 2014 period. The FED treatment programme began in June 2014 and so around half of the monitoring in 2014 covers this period.</p> <p>The report found that concentrations of artificial radionuclides in aquatic materials, including seaweed and locally caught fish and shellfish were low.</p> <p>The report found also that the total dose to members of the public, from all sources and pathways, was less than 0.5% of the legal dose limit of exposures of members of the public to ionising radiation.</p> <p>Our environmental monitoring programme continues to show that the levels of radioactivity in the environment are not significant from a radiological perspective.</p> <p>We have already enhanced the coverage of our environmental monitoring programme to take into account public concern over the FED treatment programme.</p> <p>The results obtained from our recent monitoring continue to show that levels of radioactivity in the environment during the FED treatment campaign are similar to the levels of radioactivity found in the environment previously.</p>

<b>Topic: Consultation on the RSR environmental permit application</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>We received several representations that our consultation on the RSR environmental permit application was inadequate.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR20, PR23, PR28, PR29, PR32, PR41</p>	<p>We have decided to consult key partner organisations; the public; and interested parties on our draft decision and draft RSR permit for this application.</p> <p>We did not consult on the application. This application is considered to be a small administrative change, as there is no change being sought to the limits in the permit. Our procedures and guidance covering how we deal with environmental permit applications for nuclear sites do not require us to consult on such applications.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we did inform interested parties that we received the RSR permit variation application from Magnox.</p> <p>We did not receive any requests for the RSR application, although we note that a small number of the representations received on the non-RSR variation applications related to the radioactive aspects of Bradwell Site's discharges. We therefore decided to respond to these comments, as set out in this Annex, and to make our draft RSR permit and draft decision publically available for comment along with those covering the non-RSR aspects of the discharge.</p>

<b>Topic: Provision of information/transparency</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Included in many of the responses were comments attributed to Magnox and others related to information made available to the public, including via the Bradwell Site Local Community Liaison Council (LCLC).</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR6, PR7, PR9, PR10, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR18, PR19, PR21, PR25, PR26, PR28 PR29, PR30, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR38, PR39, PR43, PR44</p>	<p>These comments do not have a bearing on our decision in relation to this environmental permit variation application. It is our view that these are matters for Magnox to respond to. We recommend that any specific queries or information requests of this nature are directed to the owner of the relevant information.</p> <p>We are committed to operating openly and transparently and have been consistent in our reporting about the environmental significance of permitted discharges.</p>

**Topic: Matters outside the variation to the permit**

<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Information has been requested on the planning requirements in relation to the outfall structure.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR11</p>	<p>The planning requirements in relation to the outfall structure are a matter for the relevant planning authority.</p> <p>We recommend that this information request is directed to the owner of the relevant information.</p>
<p>We note a number of representations included subjective personal statements or preferences about reducing or stopping discharges from FED treatment at Bradwell Site, without providing relevant supporting information or evidence.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR8, PR9, PR10, PR12, PR15, PR16, PR17, PR18, PR19, PR21, PR22, PR25, PR26, PR27, PR28, PR29, PR30, PR31 PR33, PR34, PR35, PR36, PR37 PR38, PR39, PR40, PR42, PR43, PR44</p>	<p>Our permitting decisions take account of broad aspects of detriments, including social and other impacts, as well as the environmental impacts.</p> <p>We have extensive powers to stop discharges where there is evidence of potentially significant environmental harm. We are only likely to use these powers in an enforcement scenario, where the environmental impact is significantly greater than would arise from routine discharges that are controlled under an environmental permit. Potential significant harm to the environment is only likely to arise where discharges are substantially above the thresholds set out in the permit.</p> <p>Our decisions must also be fair and reasonable, and must take account of an operator's business needs, in order for us to continue to meet our requirement to support sustainable growth.</p>

## **Annex 2 – Consultation on the draft decision**

The draft decision has been advertised and consulted upon in accordance with the Environment Agency's Public Participation Statement. The way in which this has been carried out, the results of our consultation, and how we have taken consultation responses into account in reaching our decision are summarised in this annex. Copies of all consultation responses have been placed on the Environment Agency public register, except where the person making the response asked us not to do so.

### **How we publicised the consultation on the draft decision**

The consultation on our 'minded to' decision to grant the RSR permit was done in tandem with the consultation on our draft decision for the Water Discharge permits applications. The consultation was initially advertised as being held from 20 October 2016 to 15 November 2016. However, following a number of requests, we decided to extend the consultation period to 15 December 2016 to allow consultees and interested parties more time to respond to us.

We publicised our consultation by way of a notice that was emailed to those individuals and organisations who we had previously commented on our consultation on the Water Discharge permits variation applications (and advertising of the RSR permit application) and/or who we had previously identified as being potentially interested in hearing about the consultation. The notice provided brief details of the radioactive substances activity, and told people where and when they could see a copy of the draft decision and draft permit and where to send any comments.

We provided an online *Sharefile* page that included the draft permit and draft decision document, as well as technical documents that we considered as part of our determination of Magnox's application. A link to access the *Sharefile* web portal was included in the notice that we provided to consultees.

We also advertised the consultation in the *Essex Chronicle* and in the *Maldon and Burnham Gazette*. These advertisements were posted on 20 October 2016 and on 10 November 2016 – the latter advertisement publicising the fact that the consultation would be extended for a further 28 days.

We provided an additional notice to consultees on 1 November and 11 November 2016 to inform them that we had decided to extend the consultation

### **Who we consulted**

We wrote to the following organisations and individuals, informing them of the consultation and inviting them to participate:

- Barry Jones
- Blackwater Oystermans Association
- Charlene Clarke
- Ian Clarke
- Maldon Harbour Improvement Commissioners
- Heather Hall
- David Crafts
- Debbie Ayles
- Deborah Marshall



- Blackwater Guardians
- Ted Terry
- Emma Simmons
- E Vince
- Graham Farley
- Environmental Law Foundation
- Maldon Society
- Alan Brook
- Laura Epps
- Tollesbury and Mersea Oyster Company Limited
- West Mersea Marine
- Airbench
- Simon Lambert
- Henry Spyvee
- Marinet
- Julie Salter
- Susan and Terry Field
- West Mersea Town Council
- Terri Portmann
- Marine Management Organisation
- Timothy Hurst
- Tollesbury Parish Council
- Anthony and Margot Bailey
- Bradwell Against New Nuclear Group
- Ann Whitwham
- Roger Mullis
- Barry Turner
- Maïke Windhorst
- Nichola Caine
- Juliet Heller
- Sigrid Houston
- Sade Dubbini
- Susan Francis
- Richard Rivans
- Carole Shorney
- Emily Parr
- Liz Carlton
- S Jordan
- S Betteridge
- Linda Foord
- John Le Seve
- Emma Randall

- Neil Beddoe
- Shirley Swan
- Alan Mason
- Tony Seaman
- Ray King
- Essex Wildlife Trust
- Essex County Council
- Maldon District Council
- Kent and Essex Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority
- Brightlingsea Harbour Office
- Stephen Webb (by letter)
- E Lee (by letter)
- Jean Smith (by letter)
- Cherrie MacGregor

### Responses to the consultation on our ‘minded to’ decision

As stated in Part 1, this document concerns an application from Magnox to make a number of changes to the RSR permit. These changes are needed to allow modifications to the radioactive waste discharge system; to combine a number of approved gaseous radioactive waste discharge outlets; and to remove other gaseous waste outlets that are now redundant.

During the consultation on our ‘minded to’ decision and draft RSR permit we received a number of representations that raised issues that were not germane to our assessment of this application but centred largely around FED dissolution and radioactive waste management at Bradwell Site more generally. We note that many of these representations contain inaccurate or misleading information or statements.

Whilst we did not consider such representations as part of our assessment of this application, we recognise that FED dissolution at Bradwell is a controversial issue and have sought to include our consideration of all representations made, whether or not they had a bearing on our decision to grant the RSR permit.

We received 25 responses. These are summarised below, together with our consideration of them.

<b>Topic: Optimisation in the management and disposal of radioactive waste</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>A number of respondents have expressed the view that the operational performance of the FED treatment plant at Bradwell Site has been sub-optimal and/or that the treatment of FED at Bradwell Site does not represent BAT.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR48, PR52, PR65</p>	<p>In 2006 Magnox identified that its preferred approach for the management of FED at Bradwell Site was to treat it on-site by a process of dissolution and abatement to remove radioactivity from the discharge.</p> <p>In 2011 Magnox applied to us for changes to its RSR permit to allow them to carry out the FED treatment process. As part of our determination we considered the technical justification provided by the operator and accepted that Magnox’s decision for the treatment of FED could be pursued provided Magnox applied BAT to minimise the levels of radioactivity in the discharges and</p>

	<p>ensure that the radiological impact to members of the public was kept ALARA.</p> <p>The application included a request to increase the limits for gaseous discharges for H-3 and C-14. Therefore, in accordance with Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty, on 12 March 2012 the UK Government submitted a modified plan for the disposal of radioactive waste arising from the decommissioning of the Bradwell Site, including general data on the radiological impact to members of the public in other European member states from discharges associated with the FED treatment. We only granted the permit, in June 2012, after the European Commission had provided its opinion that the planned modification would not give rise to doses to the population in another Member State that would be significant from the point of view of health.</p> <p>The current changes requested by Magnox do not include any requests to change the nature or magnitude of their discharges (i.e. the limits in the permit). Hence, our original assessments of potential environmental impacts from discharges remain valid (see also comments under 'Radiological Assessment: Impact on non-human species and our conservation duties').</p> <p>It took Magnox longer than originally anticipated to bring the FED treatment plant on line and the treatment of FED at site did not start until June 2014.</p> <p>However, the environmental performance of the FED treatment process (abatement to reduce the levels of radioactivity in the discharge) has remained consistent with our regulatory expectations. We are satisfied that the treatment of FED is compatible with the requirement to apply BAT to ensure that radioactivity in the discharges is kept ALARA. The levels of radioactivity in the discharges remain well within the limits set in the environmental permit.</p> <p>This does not mean an alternative approach could not equally be demonstrated to be compatible with the requirement to apply BAT. We recognise that a number of other possible approaches to the management of the FED waste could be equally acceptable from an environmental perspective.</p>
<p>Some respondents have stated their opposition to any proposals that might be made for the future importation of FED from other nuclear sites for dissolution at Bradwell Site.</p>	<p>It is a requirement of the environmental permit that transfers of radioactive waste between sites can only be made via an optimised disposal route. In addition, the possible future importation of FED to Bradwell Site from other nuclear sites might require planning approval.</p>

<p><b>Raised by:</b> PR48, PR51</p>	<p>The conditions of the RSR permit do not prevent Magnox from disposing of FED that has come from other nuclear sites at Bradwell Site.</p> <p>We are not aware of any such proposals from Magnox and do not see this as a likely priority for Magnox in the future, as this would further extend the Bradwell decommissioning programme and delay the site's entry to Care and Maintenance.</p> <p>However, if Magnox's plans were to change we would consider such proposals on the basis of the evidence that would be needed in order to demonstrate that this disposal route is optimised.</p>
<p>Some respondents suggested that Magnox should consider alternative ways of dealing with the discharges from the FED treatment process.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR52, PR68</p>	<p><b>Transport of FED effluent by boat for subsequent discharge to the open sea:</b></p> <p>The transfer of radioactive liquid waste for disposal at sea is not likely to be consistent with UK Government's radioactive waste discharge strategy and is likely to be in contravention of international agreements – e.g. OSPAR explicitly bans the sea-dumping of radioactive waste. Discharges of aqueous radioactive waste to the water environment via pipeline require authorisation under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. This regime ensures that the environmental impact of such discharges is minimised.</p> <p>From an environmental impact perspective it is also unlikely that any reduction to localised radiological impact would be offset by the wider environmental impacts associated with transportation. In addition, such an approach is likely to be unreasonable, in terms of the associated implications for worker health and safety; highly resource intensive; expensive; and impractical.</p> <p>We have not considered this suggestion further.</p> <p><b>Transportation of effluent from the FED treatment process to Dungeness or Sizewell for discharge via existing sea pipelines</b></p> <p>We have not considered this suggestion further as our radiological assessments demonstrate that the dose impacts on the local population or habitat sites near Bradwell are not significant.</p> <p><b>Encapsulation of FED and storage pending final disposal</b></p> <p>The decommissioning strategy for Bradwell Site is a matter for Magnox and the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. Our role is to ensure that proposals and decisions by Magnox in relation to the disposal of radioactive waste, in</p>

	<p>all forms, at Bradwell Site are undertaken in compliance with the RSR permit that is in place to authorise these disposals.</p> <p>In Annex 1 we commented on similar representations that were made in relation to whether or not the FED treatment process represented BAT. These comments remain applicable and will not be set out further.</p> <p>Nevertheless we have noted that Magnox have identified a new disposal route for lower activity FED material. A new permit and revised waste acceptance criteria at the low level waste repository (LLWR) have enabled disposal as solid low level waste to be considered as an option. A consignment of FED has already been sent for disposal to LLWR via the Inutec treatment site. This has reduced the amount of FED to be treated at Bradwell. Further consignments of lower activity FED may be sent to LLWR if characterisation demonstrates that it meets the LLWR acceptance criteria.</p>
--	---

**Topic: Radiological Assessment: Comparison with constraints and limits**

<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Some respondents raised concerns that the ongoing discharges of radioactive waste from the site pose a risk of harm to people.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR48, PR49, PR51, PR54, PR55, PR56, PR57, PR58, PR59, PR65, PR67, PR68</p>	<p>We have carried out detailed assessments of the potential radiological impact of discharges made from Bradwell Site, including the potential impact to public health. We undertook these assessments as part of our determination of previous applications from Magnox regarding the discharge of radioactive waste from the FED treatment process.</p> <p>We did not repeat our radiological assessments in our determination of this application. We thought this was appropriate because this application did not seek to change the limits in the permit.</p> <p>The most recent assessment of the potential impact to members of the public was published in the Radioactivity in Food and the Environment (RIFE) report 2015 (Reference 23). This indicates the radiological impact due to radioactive liquid discharges remains less than 5 microsieveverts, which corresponds to less than 0.5% of the relevant dose limit for members of the public (or less than 0.2% of the average dose to members of the UK population from all sources of radiation).</p> <p>In practice, discharges from Bradwell Site are significantly below the limits set in the permit. Even if discharges were made at the maximum level allowed by the permit, our assessments indicate the potential radiological impact would be well below the relevant dose limit for members of the public.</p>

<b>Topic: Radiological Assessment: Impact on non-human species and our conservation duties</b>	
<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>Some respondents raised concerns that the application fails to adequately consider the impact of the liquid radioactive waste discharges on native oyster populations and, more generally, the Blackwater Estuary Marine Conservation Zone.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR48, PR49, PR51, PR54, PR56, PR57, PR58, PR59, PR60, PR62, PR65, PR67, PR68</p>	<p>The Blackwater Estuary holds a number of designations due to its important ecological value. These include designations as a Special Protection Area (SPA), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a Ramsar site, as well as a more recent designation as a Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ).</p> <p>We have undertaken detailed radiological assessments, which included looking at the potential impact of discharges from Bradwell Site on plant and animal life in the Blackwater Estuary. We undertook these assessments as part of our determination of previous applications from Magnox regarding the discharge of radioactive waste from the FED treatment process. These assessments were undertaken using our radiological screening tool.</p> <p>The underpinning information that informs our radiological screening and assessment of potential radiological impacts on habitats is set out in Science Report SC060083/SR1 (Reference 25)</p> <p>We have assessed the potential radiological impact to the environment on the basis of radioactive discharges being made at the levels of the limits in the permit.</p> <p>On this basis, the predicted dose rates to marine and terrestrial plant and animal life were still below the value where we are satisfied there will be no adverse effect on non-human species.</p> <p>The limits in the permit are not being changed so the original assessments remain valid for the proposed changes to the liquid discharge system.</p> <p>We have taken account of the recent designation of the area as an MCZ. We remain satisfied that the radioactive discharges made in accordance with the requirements of the environmental permit will not compromise the identified conservation objectives.</p>

**Topic: Environmental Monitoring and monitoring of discharges**

<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>We received queries concerning the regulatory programme of radiological environmental monitoring that is undertaken around Bradwell Site, including the scope and coverage of the programme and the availability of the data.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR65</p>	<p>Environmental monitoring around Bradwell Site is undertaken separately by Magnox and the relevant regulatory authorities (i.e. the Environment Agency and the FSA).</p> <p>The results of Magnox’s environmental monitoring programme are required to be submitted to us under Bradwell Site’s RSR permit. This information is used by Magnox to assess the annual retrospective dose received by members of the public. It is also a requirement under the site’s environmental permit to provide this information to us.</p> <p>This information is available to the public.</p> <p>A separate independent programme of environmental monitoring around Bradwell Site is also carried out for the Environment Agency and the FSA.</p> <p>The results of this independent monitoring programme are included in the RIFE report, which is published annually.</p> <p>Since the FED treatment programme at Bradwell Site began in June 2014 data from both Magnox’s and the independent environmental monitoring programmes have been collected and summarised in RIFE reports 20 and 21.</p> <p>The reports found that concentrations of artificial radionuclides in aquatic materials, including seaweed and locally caught fish and shellfish continue to remain low.</p> <p>Our environmental monitoring programme continues to show that the levels of radioactivity in the environment are not significant from a radiological perspective.</p> <p>We have already enhanced the coverage of our environmental monitoring programme to take into account public concern over the FED treatment programme.</p> <p>The results obtained from our recent monitoring continue to show that levels of radioactivity in the environment during the FED treatment campaign are similar to the levels of radioactivity found in the environment previously.</p>

**Topic: Consultation on our 'minded to' decision to grant the RSR environmental permit and on the draft RSR permit**

**Summary of issues raised**

We received several representations that the consultation on our 'minded to' decision and draft RSR permit was inadequate.

**Raised by:** PR48, PR68

**Our consideration of the issues**

We decided to consult key partner organisations; the public; and interested parties on our draft decision and draft RSR permit.

The consultation on our 'minded to' decision to grant the RSR permit was undertaken in parallel with the consultation on our draft decisions in relation to the Water Discharge permits variations applications from Magnox.

Specific information regarding how we carried out our consultation and who we consulted is set out above.

We received feedback during the consultation on our 'minded to' decision to grant the RSR permit that the consultation period was not long enough to allow consultees to properly review the technical information that we considered as part of our determination of the applications from Magnox. Following this feedback we decided to extend the initial 28 day consultation period by a further 28 days.

We consider that 56 days allows an acceptable period of time for consultees and interested parties to review the information associated with Magnox's RSR permit application.



**Topic: Matters outside the variation to the permit**

<b>Summary of issues raised</b>	<b>Our consideration of the issues</b>
<p>We received a number of representations concerning the FED dissolution and treatment process in terms of its justification as a practice, as required by the European Basic Safety Standards Directive (Council Directive 96/29/Euratom). Specifically, these representations demand that the justification of the FED dissolution and treatment process be re-examined.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR56, PR57, PR58, PR59, PR60, PR62, PR65, PR65</p>	<p>The requirements concerning the justification of practices involving ionising radiation, as set out in the Basic Safety Standards Directive, are administered in UK law via the Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiations Regulations 2004.</p> <p>The regulations acknowledge all previous justification decisions in the UK, where these have been expressly made.</p> <p>The relevant justified Practice in relation to Bradwell Site falls under row 3 in Annex 3 of the guidance document associated with the application and administration of the Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiations Regulations 2004 (Reference 23) – generation of electricity by nuclear reactors – operation of Magnox power stations.</p> <p>Government guidance associated with the Justification of Practices Involving Ionising Radiations Regulations 2004 is clear that waste management and disposal operations, such as the dissolution and treatment of FED, are an integral part of the practice generating the waste and that it is incorrect to regard them as stand-alone practices requiring individual justification. In this case the relevant justified practice is the operation of Magnox power stations.</p> <p>Decisions concerning the justification of a practice involving the use of ionising radiation are a matter for UK Government and we have not considered this issue further in this document.</p>
<p>We note a number of representations included subjective personal statements or preferences about reducing or stopping discharges from FED treatment at Bradwell Site, or otherwise opposing the application from Magnox, without providing relevant supporting information or evidence.</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR48, PR49, PR51, PR55, PR61, PR65, PR68</p>	<p>Our permitting decisions take account of broad aspects of detriments, including social and other impacts, as well as the environmental impacts.</p> <p>We have extensive powers to stop discharges where there is evidence of potentially significant environmental harm. We are only likely to use these powers in an enforcement scenario, where the environmental impact is significantly greater than would arise from routine discharges that are controlled under an environmental permit. Potential significant harm to the environment is only likely to arise where discharges are substantially above the thresholds set out in the permit.</p> <p>Our decisions must also be fair and reasonable, and must take account of an operator's business needs, in order for</p>

	us to continue to meet our requirement to support sustainable growth.
<p>Some consultees raised concerns and/or objections to the proposed siting of a new nuclear power station adjacent to the existing power station at Bradwell</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR49, PR54</p>	<p>While we acknowledge that this is a controversial issue in the local area, this is not a relevant matter in terms of our determination of this application.</p>
<p>A number of respondents have expressed concerns that the current permit does not effectively control the discharge of particulate containing alpha-emitting particles such as uranium and actinides</p> <p><b>Raised by:</b> PR56, PR57, PR58, PR59, PR60, PR65, PR67,</p>	<p>Both the current and varied RSR permits contain conditions that specify the use of BAT to exclude entrained solids from aqueous radioactive wastes.</p> <p>The permits require Magnox to sample, monitor and report discharges from Bradwell Site.</p> <p>Both the current and varied RSR permits include limits on aqueous discharges of Cs-137 and tritium, as well as 'other radionuclides'. The 'other radionuclides' limit includes all alpha emitting radionuclides.</p> <p>There is a requirement for Magnox to report the total annual release of alpha emitting radionuclides including uranium isotopes and actinides. This is reported annual in the site's Pollution Inventory.</p> <p>Recent discharges of alpha emitting radionuclides are very low.</p>

### Annex 3 - References

1. Cover letter to accompany Magnox application (Magnox, EA52453, dated 14 July 2015)
2. Details of Proposed Variation to EPR permit EPR/ZP3493SQ to Modify Aqueous Discharge Line Outfall (Magnox, BRAD/EN/REP/099, dated 15 June 2015)
3. Variation to Permit EPR/ZP3493SQ for Gaseous and Particulate Discharges at Bradwell Site (Magnox, BRAD/EN/REP/141, dated 16 June 2015)
4. Introduction to the Safety and Environment Management Prospectus (Magnox, M-023, Issue 3, dated 19 March 2015)
5. Notice for further information and accompanying cover letter (Environment Agency, EPR/ZP3493SQ/V005, dated 29 September 2015)
6. An Assessment Report Demonstrating How the Proposed System for the Disposal of Radioactive Aqueous Waste and for the Discharge of Treated Sewage Effluent and Storm Water to the Blackwater Estuary Represents Best Available Techniques (Magnox, BRAD/EN/REP/169, dated 20 October 2015)
7. Letter requesting more time to determine permit application (Environment Agency, EPR/ZP3493SQ, dated 18 September 2015)
8. Letter accepting proposal to extend period of determination for permit application to 1 February 2016 (Magnox, EA52515, dated 22 September 2015)
9. Magnox Bradwell Site Environmental Permit EPR/ZP3493SQ (Environment Agency, dated 26 February 2013)
10. Letter requesting more time to determine permit application (Environment Agency, dated 29 January 2016)
11. Signed copy of Environment Agency letter accepting proposal to extend period of determination for permit application to 1 June 2016 (Magnox, EPR/ZP3493SQ, dated 2 February 2016)
12. Magnox correspondence following request for further information in relation to turbidity of discharges from Final Monitoring and Delay Tanks (Magnox, dated 26 October 2015)
13. FDT Turbidity A and B Sample – (Magnox, dated 22 October 2015)
14. Radioactivity in Food and the Environment report 2014 (RIFE-20, dated October 2015)
15. Environmental Permitting: Handling and Determining Environmental Permit Applications for Radioactive Substances Activities on Nuclear Sites (Environment Agency, Operational Instruction 247\_10, dated 11 July 2013)
16. Radiological Monitoring Technical Guidance Note 2 – Environmental Radiological Monitoring (Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency and Food Standards Agency, 764\_11/GEHO0811BTVY-E-E, Version 1, dated December 2010)
17. Blackwater, Crouch, Roach and Colne Estuaries Marine Conservation Zone (MCZ) – Supplementary Advice on Conserving and Restoring Site Features (Natural England, undated)
18. Decision Document for environmental permit variation application from Magnox for Bradwell Site - EPR/ZP3493SQ/V002 - (Environment Agency, dated 2 April 2012)
19. Letter requesting more time to determine permit application (Environment Agency, dated 19 July 2016)
20. Letter accepting proposal to extend period of determination for permit application to 3 January 2017

21. Letter requesting more time to determine permit application (Environment Agency, dated 26 September 2016)
22. Letter accepting proposal to extend period of determination for permit application to 3 January 2017
23. The Justification of Practices Involving ionising Radiation Regulation 2004 – Guidance on their Application and Administration. Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.
24. Radioactivity in Food and the Environment report 2015 (RIFE-21, dated October 2016)
25. Habitats Assessment for Radioactive Substances - Science Report SC060083/SR1 (Environment Agency, dated May 2009) – available to download from Gov.uk website
26. Letter requesting more time to determine permit application (Environment Agency, dated 20 December 2016)
27. Letter accepting proposal to extend period of determination for permit application to 1 February 2017