



## Assessing new nuclear power station designs

Generic design assessment of Hitachi-GE's Advanced Boiling Water Reactor

Assessment report - AR09 Public Dose

December 2017

The Environment Agency protects and improves the environment.

We help people and wildlife adapt to climate change and reduce its impacts, including flooding, drought, sea level rise and coastal erosion.

We improve the quality of our water, land and air by tackling pollution. We work with businesses to help them comply with environmental regulations. A healthy and diverse environment enhances people's lives and contributes to economic growth.

We can't do this alone. We work as part of the Defra group (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs), with the rest of government, local councils, businesses, civil society groups and local communities to create a better place for people and wildlife.

Natural Resources Wales is the largest Welsh government sponsored body. We were formed in April 2013, largely taking over the functions of the Countryside Council for Wales, Forestry Commission Wales and the Environment Agency in Wales, as well as certain Welsh government functions.

Natural Resources Wales' purpose is to pursue sustainable management of natural resources in all of our work.

Natural Resources Wales brings together the skills and expertise needed to ensure that we can operate effectively across our wide range of roles from adviser, facilitator, regulator and designator, to incident responder, partner and operator.

Published by:

Environment Agency  
Horizon house, Deanery Road,  
Bristol BS1 5AH  
Email: [enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@environment-agency.gov.uk)  
[www.gov.uk/environment-agency](http://www.gov.uk/environment-agency)

Natural Resources Wales  
Cambria House  
29 Newport Road  
Cardiff, CF24 0TP  
Email: [enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

© Environment Agency 2017

© Natural Resources Wales 2017

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

Further copies of this report are available from our publications catalogue:  
[www.gov.uk/government/publications](http://www.gov.uk/government/publications)

or our National Customer Contact Centre:  
T: 03708 506506

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

or  
Natural Resources Wales: 0300 065 3000  
Email: [enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk)

# Executive summary

<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 (P&amp;ID) are relevant to this assessment:</p> <p>Item 7: a prospective radiological assessment at the proposed limits for discharges and for any on-site incineration. This lays down the main areas to be covered in the dose assessment.</p>
<b>Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles<sup>2</sup></b>	<p>The following Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles (REPs) are relevant to this assessment:</p> <p>Fundamental Principle E – Protecting human health and the environment</p> <p>Specifically the following REPs are partly or completely relevant:</p> <p>SEDP1 - General RSR principle for siting new facilities</p> <p>SEDP2 - Movement of radioactive material in the environment</p> <p>RPDP1 - Optimisation of protection</p> <p>RPDP2 - Dose limits and constraints</p> <p>RPDP4 - Prospective dose assessments for radioactive discharges to the environment</p>
<b>Report author</b>	Dr John Titley

In order to demonstrate that radioactive discharges resulting from the operation of a reactor design would not challenge the UK’s dose constraints and limit for the radiation exposure of the public, we require a radiological impact assessment to be carried out by reactor vendors, in this case Hitachi-GE.

We have carried out an assessment of Hitachi-GE’s radiological assessment that it provided under generic design assessment (GDA) for the UK Advanced Boiling Water Reactor (UK ABWR). This assessment report addresses important parts of the process and information document (P&ID) (Environment Agency, 2016b) and relevant parts of the Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles (REPs) (Environment Agency, 2010).

---

<sup>1</sup> Process and information document for generic assessment of candidate nuclear power plant designs, Version 3, Environment Agency, 2016.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-of-candidate-nuclear-power-plant-designs>

<sup>2</sup> Regulatory Guidance Series, No RSR 1: Radioactive Substances Regulation – Environmental Principles, Version 2), Environment Agency, April 2010.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/296388/geho0709bqsb-e-e.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/296388/geho0709bqsb-e-e.pdf)

We have assessed information in the GDA submission Hitachi-GE made for the UK ABWR (Hitachi-GE, 2017a), with respect to prospective (future) doses to members of the public as a result of the disposal of liquid and gaseous radioactive waste from the UK ABWR to the environment. There have been several revisions of the assessment taking into account Regulatory Queries (RQs) we raised and changes to the expected discharges (source term). The assessment results are reported in Revision G (Hitachi-GE, 2017a).

We appointed contactors to verify and validate the radiological impact assessment Hitachi-GE made for the UK ABWR at the generic site, and to make an independent assessment of doses to members of the public from the UK ABWR at the generic site (Environment Agency, 2016a).

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, including Oldbury in Gloucestershire and Wylfa on Anglesey. The first site at which the UK ABWR might be constructed is Wylfa, Oldbury may also be a site for the UK ABWR in the future. These locations have been taken into account in the generic site description (Hitachi-GE, 2017b; Environment Agency, 2017a) that was used in the dose assessment Hitachi-GE carried out (Hitachi-GE, 2017a) and in our independent dose assessment (Environment Agency, 2016a).

We conclude that, for the operation of a UK ABWR at any coastal site identified as suitable for new nuclear power stations and with discharges at the limits specified by Hitachi-GE:

- The radiation dose to people will be below the UK constraint for any single new source of 300 micro-Sieverts per year ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ ).
- Doses to the public from discharges and direct radiation from a single ABWR are in the range of 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Most of the dose is from Carbon-14 in the gaseous discharges.
- Doses to the public from aqueous liquid discharges are very low, in the range of 0.000002 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . This is because the discharge of radioactivity is very small, due to the recycling, clean up and reuse of waste waters.
- Doses from direct radiation makes a contribution of between 0.3 and 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ .
- Hitachi-GE has made an adequate assessment of the impact of the gaseous and aqueous liquid discharges to the environment.

Our assessment was able to verify and validate Hitachi-GE's assessment.

Our independent assessment considered a more restrictive coastal environment than the one Hitachi-GE used. Our assessment shows that the low levels of radioactivity in aqueous liquid discharges from the UK ABWR leads to low doses to the public in an environment with restricted dispersion.

Doses from our independent dose assessment are similar to those from Hitachi-GE (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). They range from 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , mostly from Carbon-14 in gaseous discharges.

Our independent assessment also shows very low doses from liquid discharges. The group most exposed to liquid discharges receives more dose from gaseous discharges and direct radiation than from liquid discharges.

The assessments show that most of the dose from discharge is from gaseous discharges of carbon-14. Therefore, we have included an assessment finding noting that consideration should be given to the current and future options for the abatement of carbon-14 in gaseous discharges as part of our assessment of best available techniques (BAT) (Environment Agency, 2017b).

There are no GDA Issues or Assessment Findings (AFs) arising from the prospective assessment of doses to the public. This is because the expected doses to the public from discharges and direct radiation are well below relevant dose criteria.

In line with our usual procedures we will require a detailed site-specific impact assessment to be carried out during the site-specific permitting stage. The site-specific assessment should consider the actual environmental characteristics of the proposed site; the number of UK ABWR units that will be present and discharges from any other sources of radioactivity.

The site specific assessment will be to demonstrate that doses to members of the public and non-human species from the UK ABWR will be as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) and below relevant dose constraint and dose limits. Comparison against the dose limit should be carried out at site-specific permitting when contributions from all sources of radiation can be included.

We have not made the need for a site-specific assessment a GDA finding because a site-specific assessment is a requirement of the permitting process.

# Contents

<b>Executive summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Contents</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles (REPs)</b> .....	<b>7</b>
2.1. Process and information document (P&ID) .....	8
<b>3. Assessment</b> .....	<b>9</b>
3.1. Our assessment method.....	9
3.2. Timeline of submissions and assessment.....	9
3.3. GDA Step 1 .....	10
3.4. Modelling approaches .....	10
3.5. UK ABWR source term - discharges to air and to water.....	11
<b>4. Results</b> .....	<b>17</b>
4.1. Doses from the UK ABWR from Revision G .....	17
4.2. Stage 1 and stage 2 dose assessment.....	17
4.3. Hitachi-GE Stage 3 dose assessment .....	18
4.4. Build-up of radionuclides in the environment .....	19
4.5. Collective dose .....	19
4.6. Independent assessment.....	20
4.7. Direct radiation doses .....	22
4.8. Conclusion.....	23
<b>5. Compliance with Environment Agency requirements</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>6. Public comments and our responses</b> .....	<b>25</b>
<b>7. Conclusion</b> .....	<b>34</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>36</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Glossary</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>Appendix A - The UK ABWR source term used in the prospective assessment</b> .....	<b>42</b>
A.1 Introduction .....	42
A.2. Liquid discharges .....	42
A.3. Gaseous discharges .....	43
A.4 Short duration releases to the atmosphere.....	45
<b>Appendix B – Detail of predicted doses</b> .....	<b>46</b>
B.1 Hitachi-GE assessment Revision F .....	46
<b>Appendix C - Direct radiation dose to the public from the site</b> .....	<b>49</b>
C.1 Introduction .....	49
C.2. Assessment of direct radiation doses.....	49



# 1. Introduction

In order to assess the potential radiological impact of a particular reactor design we need to assess the potential radiation exposure of members of the public. These may result from discharges of radionuclides and from any exposure off-site from direct radiation from radioactive sources within the reactor structures. Prospective dose assessments are required to determine the potential radiological impact of a reactor design and to inform optimisation decisions at the design stage.

At the GDA stage we need to satisfy ourselves that:

- the reactor design is such that any radiological impacts would be acceptable to the UK
- any particular features of the reactor design that may lead to impacts of a type or size that could constrain the locations at which such a plant could be located are identified
- any radiological impacts of new build reactors in the UK are as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA), in line with the policy set out in the Energy white paper (BERR, 2008) and in the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 (Schedule 23) (Stationary Office, 2016)

The assessment Hitachi-GE provided is of the predicted radiological impact of the UK ABWR on people and wildlife from discharges into the environment (at proposed permit limits) and from direct radiation (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). Our assessment of the Hitachi-GE submission is to make sure that it is comprehensive, is based on a valid approach and is technically correct. We have also commissioned an independent assessment, taking into account the information Hitachi-GE provided. This assessment will be reported separately as an independent dose assessment, verification and validation in this assessment report (Environment Agency, 2016a).

The Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales regulate the discharges of radioactive waste into the environment during normal operation, making sure that any radiation exposure of the public that may result is within the statutory dose limits and constraints. The Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) is responsible for regulating nuclear safety, including making sure that doses to the public resulting from direct radiation during normal operation are acceptable and below the statutory dose limits. Direct radiation is received directly from radioactive sources within a nuclear power station, instead of indirectly as a result of radioactive discharges.

This assessment report considers the information Hitachi-GE provided for its UK ABWR design. We appointed a technical specialist contractor (TSC), (Quintessa) to review the information and make a technical assessment by validating the approach Hitachi-GE took and verifying the results. Our TSC also carried out an independent assessment of the predicted environmental activity concentrations and radiological impact to people and wildlife from the UK ABWR at a generic site (Environment Agency, 2016a). The generic site was based on the one Hitachi-GE provided. However, the generic site for our independent assessment took into account the relevant characteristics of other UK locations where a UK ABWR might be constructed in future. Some variations in modelling assumptions and inputs from the generic site were applied in our independent assessment (Environment Agency, 2016a).

## 2. Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles (REPs)

In the REPs (Environment Agency, 2010) the following are partly or completely relevant to this assessment:

Fundamental Principle E – Protecting human health and the environment

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.

We have produced a separate assessment report on the generic site proposed by Hitachi-GE and used in its assessment (Environment Agency, 2017a).

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.

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.

RPDP2 Dose limits and constraints - Radiation doses to individual people shall be below the relevant dose limits and constraints.

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.

## 2.1. Process and information document (P&ID)

In our P&ID (Environment Agency, 2016b), we set out our requirements to a requesting party. Table 1 shows the information that a requesting party is required to provide in its submission to address radiological assessment.

**Table 1. Information required for prospective radiological assessment**

Information required (Item 7)	Main REPs & references
<p>A prospective radiological assessment at the proposed limits for discharges and for any on-site incineration.</p> <p>Include:</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 members of the public</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</li> </ul>	<p>REPs: RPDP2 and 4</p> <p>References: Environment Agency et al., 2012</p>



Information required (Item 7)	Main REPs & references
<p>lifetime discharges, might have the potential to prejudice legitimate users or uses of the land or sea</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collective dose up to 500 years to the UK, European and world populations</li> <li>• dose-rate to non-human species*</li> </ul> <p>State which models were used to calculate these doses and why they are appropriate, and set out all the data and assumptions (with reasoning) used as input to the models. For those items marked with an asterisk (*), we recommend the use of our Initial Radiological Assessment Tool (available on request), refining the default data to reflect the characteristics of the facility and generic site</p>	

## 3. Assessment

### 3.1. Our assessment method

Our overall assessment method included the following main steps:

- considering the generic environmental permit (GEP) submissions Hitachi-GE made, in particular the prospective dose assessment document (Hitachi-GE, 2017a)
- discussions with Hitachi-GE to clarify our understanding of the information presented and to explain any concerns we had with that information; where we believed information Hitachi-GE provided was still not enough, we considered raising Regulatory Issues (RIs), Regulatory Observations (ROs) or Regulatory Queries (RQs)
- verification and validation of the assessment submitted Hitachi-GE submitted
- carrying out our own independent assessment (by our technical specialist contractor TSC) using the information Hitachi-GE provided
- determining whether any potential GDA Issues or Assessment Findings (AFs) should be carried forward from GDA

The prospective assessment of doses to members of the public requires 5 main activities:

- defining the environmental features of the generic site
- determining the input data and models, for example expected discharges of aqueous and gaseous radioactive waste ('source term') and models and methods for predicting environmental dispersion, concentrations and dose rates in the environment
- establishing the likely off-site radiation exposures from 'direct radiation'
- calculating, using models, of the exposure situations, for example activity concentrations and external dose rates in the environment
- calculating doses to the public

### 3.2. Timeline of submissions and assessment

Hitachi-GE made 7 versions of its submission for the prospective dose assessment, which is part of the GEP. The changes to the submissions were influenced by activities in other parts of the GDA, in particular direct radiation, reactor chemistry and discharges arising from the source term. Table 2 below shows the prospective dose modelling/assessment submissions Hitachi-GE made.

**Table 2 - Timeline of prospective dose submissions**

Date	Document	Revision	Reviewed/assessed
December 2013	GA91-9901-0026-00001	A	Initial feedback.
March 2014	GA91-9901-0026-00001	B	RQs raised.
March 2014	GA91-9901-0026-00001	C	RQs raised.
August 2014	GA91-9901-0026-00001 (First discharges source term). (Revised direct radiation) (RQs closed)	D	Initial assessment Verification, validation and independent assessment using TSC. Feedback provided to Hitachi-GE in meetings in February and March 2015.
February 2016	GA91-9901-0026-00001 (Second discharges source term)	E	Detailed assessment. Most verification and validation completed confirmation that RQ responses were present. New RQs raised.
July 2016	GA91-9901-0026-00001 (Third discharges source term) (RQs closed)	F	Detailed assessment. Finalisation of verification and validation. Independent assessment completed. Confirmation that RQ responses were present.
August 2017	GA91-9901-0026-00001 (RQs closed)	G	Confirmation of changes from remaining RQ responses Check of source term/discharges Check of final doses

### 3.3. GDA Step 1

The first 3 submissions (Revisions A to C) were made under Step 1. We provided feedback on Revision A and raised formal RQs on Revisions B and C.

### 3.4. Modelling approaches

Mathematical models are used to calculate the dispersion of radionuclides in the environment and provide predictions of radionuclide concentrations in air, soil, food, water and sediment at future times. The predicted radionuclide concentrations are then combined with information on human habits such as occupancy times and food consumption data to build up a picture of future potential doses.

Hitachi-GE proposed to use several models for predicting environmental dispersion. It proposed using the PC-CREAM 08 software system (Smith et al., 2009) in assessing the dispersion of radionuclides expected to be discharged over the expected generating lifetime of the reactor (60 years).

The PC-CREAM 08 software system (Smith et al., 2009) implements a series of models specifically designed for assessing environmental concentrations from continuous discharges of radioactive wastes made under normal operation. The models are suitable for assessing the fate of long-term continuous discharges, and calculates average concentrations of radionuclides over a number of years – of gases to air and of liquid waste to the water (aqueous) environment. The software uses the predicted concentrations to calculate the annual radiation doses to members of the public.

The environmental concentrations predicted by PC-CREAM 08 take into account build-up of discharged radionuclides over the period of discharges. Environmental concentrations can be calculated, allowing for build-up in soil, vegetation and farm animals, sea water, suspended sediment, sea bed sediment, fish and shellfish.

For the UK ABWR, Hitachi-GE has provided information that indicates that the reactor systems are designed to recycle most liquid waste rather than discharge it. Therefore, discharges of radionuclides in liquid effluent are expected to be very low. The discharges made to the atmosphere are expected to be greater than those in liquid effluent.

In addition to the continuous discharges made at a constant rate, there is a need to consider elevated discharges over short periods as a result of foreseeable events, such as during shut-down or start-up.

The PC-CREAM 08 system is not designed for assessing short duration releases of gases. Other models are available to assess short duration releases to the atmosphere. Appropriate short duration release models include ADMS (CERC, 2012) and AERMOD (US EPA, 2004). Hitachi-GE has used the ADMS model version 5 (CERC, 2012). This model can provide estimates of transient concentrations of pollutants in air at ground level from a defined release over time frames of 30 minutes. Deposition onto the ground and through the environment, including in soil and the plants are derived from the short duration air concentrations.

Collective doses to the UK, Europe and the world from discharges also need to be assessed. This takes into account the distribution of radioactivity over these population groups. The PC-CREAM 08 system is suitable for calculating collective doses from gaseous discharges and liquid discharges. Hitachi-GE has used PC-CREAM 08 (Smith et al., 2009) to estimate collective doses over 500 years to these populations per year of discharge.

### 3.5. UK ABWR source term - discharges to air and to water

The UK ABWR source term and discharges to air and water is a main input to the prospective dose modelling assessment. The source term for discharges to air and water used in Revision G of the dose assessment (Hitachi-GE, 2017a) is described in 'Quantification of discharges and limits' Revision G (Hitachi-GE, 2017c).

Hitachi-GE presented 3 source terms for discharges to air and water during the development of the GEP submission. Appendix A shows the source terms (to assess discharges to air and water) that were used in the prospective dose assessment.

The source term for discharges change as a result of Hitachi-GE's changes to the full UK ABWR source term. It made the changes in response to RQs, ROs and an RI related to the full UK ABWR source term submitted to ONR and the Environment Agency.

The full UK ABWR source term development by Hitachi-GE; the RQs, the ROs and the RI are not the subject of this part of the assessment, but were assessed as part of the assessments relating to gaseous radioactive waste (Environment Agency, 2017c), aqueous radioactive waste (Environment Agency, 2017d), and solid radioactive waste and spent fuel (Environment Agency, 2017e). The discharges source term used by Hitachi-GE in Revision G (Hitachi-GE, 2017a) of the

prospective dose modelling report is summarised in Appendix A. Revision G is the latest version and is what the decision document and this report is based on.

### 3.5.1. Discharges to air

The discharges to air occur via the main stack. The main stack is supplied by discharges from the off-gas system, the heating, ventilation and air conditioning system (HVAC) and the turbine gland steam system (TGS).

Discharges from the off-gas (OG) system are noble gases and carbon-14. The OG features charcoal decay beds that remove iodine and reduce the discharge of noble gases.

Discharges from the HVAC include iodine, tritium and particulates carrying metallic radionuclides such as chromium-51, cobalt-60 and caesium-137.

The most important radionuclide in the discharges from the TGS are of tritium.

### 3.5.2. Discharges as liquids

The discharges as liquids are expected to be very low in terms of quantity of liquid and amount of radionuclides. This is because the UK ABWR recycles much of the liquid as reactor make-up water. The main radionuclide discharged is tritium.

### 3.5.3. Result from GDA step 1

Twenty six RQs were raised during the assessment and are summarised in Table 3. The RQs were mostly related to the proposed dose assessment methods. This allowed Hitachi-GE to address RQs on the assessment method early and to allow it to include as much of the relevant information as possible before Hitachi-GE provided its submission for us to assess during our initial assessment stage.

**Table 3 - Regulatory Queries raised on the prospective dose modelling document Revisions B and C**

RQ number	Content
RQ-ABWR-0061	Reason for using caesium-137 as a surrogate for other radionuclides in the source term for the assessment is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0062	Predicted build-up of radionuclides in the environment with time – reason for selecting radionuclides to present in the figures is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0063	Calculation of doses to the foetus is needed for the detailed assessment.
RQ-ABWR-0064	Reason for differences in dominant radionuclides (in terms of dose) between the Japanese ABWR and UK ABWR is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0065	Sources of information for expected discharges are not referenced correctly.
RQ-ABWR-0066	The method for undertaking a ‘top 2’ dose assessment is not presented.
RQ-ABWR-0067	Milk products omitted from Table 5.3-2 of the Hitachi-GE dose assessment
RQ-ABWR-0068	Source of data.
RQ-ABWR-0069	Volumetric exchange rate for Stage 2 assessment.
RQ-ABWR-0108	Inconsistent presentation of particulate releases from short-term releases.

RQ number	Content
RQ-ABWR-0109	Provide references to support statements concerning a scaling factor.
RQ-ABWR-0110	Clarify the reason for selecting 57m for the stack height for the UK ABWR.
RQ-ABWR-0111	Clarification of footnotes to tables is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0112	Consideration of appropriate radionuclides to be shown in figure of seabed sediment concentrations is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0113	A more complete justification to support the statement that "it is concluded that the predicted radiological consequences will be independent of the duration of the discharges beyond 30 years" is required.
RQ-ABWR-0114	More information is needed on which 'radionuclides are of interest' and why they are of interest.
RQ-ABWR-0115	Consideration of appropriate radionuclides to be shown in figure of soil concentrations is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0116	Justification for using PC-CREAM 08 for the Stage 3 assessment is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0117	Clarification of figure legends is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0118	Direct radiation exposure of the fisherman family (from external exposure to sediment) - reason why this has not been assessed is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0119	The relationship between Pasquill stability categories used and the ADMS 5 model parameters needs to be explained.
RQ-ABWR-0120	Clarification of the skin dose calculation methodology is needed.
RQ-ABWR-0121	Explanation of the environmental concentrations from short duration releases needs to be extended.
RQ-ABWR-0122	Explanation of the collective dose results needs to be improved.
RQ-ABWR-0123	Dose criteria and their application to prospective dose assessment in GDA needs to be presented more clearly.
RQ-ABWR-0124	The explanation of the potential impact on the future use of sea or land needs to be made clearer.

### 3.5.4. GDA – initial assessment

The first formal initial assessment was made of Revision D of the prospective public dose modelling. This involved a detailed technical review. The assessment objectives for the GDA process were:

- Is the radiological impact assessment Hitachi-GE carried out reasonable and justified?
- Can the radiological impact assessment Hitachi-GE carried out be independently validated and verified?
- Are the predicted doses to members of the public below the relevant dose constraints?

A technical specialist contractor (TSC) was employed to carry out this independent technical assessment. The aim of the independent assessment was to:

- validate the assumptions and method Hitachi-GE used in its dose assessments

- verify the results and repeat the dose assessments Hitachi-GE carried out
- carry out independent dose assessments to further demonstrate that the dose assessment provided by Hitachi-GE was appropriate

### 3.5.5. Initial assessment outcomes - Revision D

Several technical matters arose from the verification and validation. These are summarised in Table 4.

**Table 4 - Technical matters related to verification and validation of the prospective dose modelling report Revision D**

Verification and validation activities
Verification activities
Doses from eating food grown on land affected by atmospheric release could not be verified for children and infants. Investigation suggests that this is because the adult intake rates have been used for infants and children.
Dose rates from beta irradiation by radionuclides deposited on the ground, following atmospheric discharge, differ significantly between the assessments for all age groups. Due to differences in beta dose factors from an older data library in an earlier version of PC-CREAM 08.
Doses from short-term discharges to atmosphere could not be verified. It was not clear which atmospheric dispersion modelling system (ADMS) parameters had been adopted. The conditions specified appeared unrepresentative of the stability conditions they were supposed to represent.
Soil concentrations, for a 60-year continuous gaseous discharge could not be verified for caesium-137, tellurium-125m (ingrown from antimony-125) and uranium-234 (ingrown from plutonium-238).
Air concentrations from a continuous gaseous release could not be verified for radioactive progeny (see glossary). It is suspected that this is related to the calculation method – Hitachi-GE scaled unit discharges, whereas the verification calculations used the specified discharge rate directly in PC-CREAM 08. However, it is not possible to be certain as the method Hitachi-GE used for determining the air concentrations of progeny is not described.
First pass collective doses for atmospheric discharges could not be verified due to the differences in the calculated external dose rate from beta emitters deposited on the ground. This is due to differences in beta dose factors from an older data library in an earlier version of PC-CREAM 08.
Validation activities
The validation activity compared the approach Hitachi-GE took in its dose assessment with the Principles for prospective public dose (Environment Agency et al., 2012). Four of the 13 Principles were not completely addressed in the Hitachi-GE dose assessment:
Principle 1 (Documentation) – In some cases, there is limited explanation and justification about why a particular assumption in the assessment has been made.
Principle 2 (Exposure of workers) – Exposure of workers is unlikely to be directly relevant in GDA, however the potential exposure of such groups is not discussed.



## Verification and validation activities

Principle 6 (Other sources of exposure) – No account has been taken of the potential contribution of other sources (nearby sites and residue from historic discharges) to an individual's exposure, however this principle is only indirectly relevant.

Principle 13 (Uncertainty and variability) – There is no exploration of uncertainty and variability for the atmospheric discharge pathway, despite the calculated doses exceeding the 0.02 mSv/y criterion used to indicate the need for assessment of uncertainty and variability. There is some limited discussion of the sensitivity of doses from liquid discharges to marine properties. However, the doses from liquid discharges are very much less than the dose criterion.

There is no discussion of the basis for selecting the generic site parameters, or whether they are suitably cautious for the GDA. There is consequently limited insight into the rationale for the assessment basis.

The reasons for including seaweed ingestion as a pathway are not clear, and the selected consumption rate is a lower option without a supporting justification for using it.

The meteorological conditions assumed for the short-term discharge scenario to the atmosphere are unlikely to be sustainable for 24 hours. The assumption is mid-summer in the growing season, which is important for nuclides that can enter the food chain. Category D conditions would not be expected to be sustained for more than a few hours in mid-summer due to the energy input from strong sunshine. However, in the Hitachi-GE assessment category D for a given time of day and therefore a certain amount of insolation (solar input), were assumed to persist over a 24-hour period, with the only variation considered being a slight change in wind direction.

The assumption of category D conditions for gaseous short-term-releases over 24 hours maybe a non-conservative assumption, but is not justified by a supporting argument. We would expect this to be considered in a sensitivity analysis.

We reviewed the technical matters in Table 4 with Hitachi-GE in meetings in February 2015 and March 2015.

Hitachi-GE produced Revision E and F, taking into account changes to the source term.

### 3.5.6. GDA - Detailed assessment of Revision E

Hitachi-GE submitted Revision E of the GEP (Table 2), which took into account the first revision of the source term.

We carried out a detailed review of Revision E. This review considered the resolution of the RQs raised on Revisions B and C, technical matters raised on Revision D (Table 4) and an update of the verification and validation of the dose assessment.

The results of the review of Revision E showed that all except one of the RQs raised on Revisions B and C had been addressed. The majority of the technical matters raised on Revision D and presented in Table 4 had also been addressed in Revision E. One RQ (RQ-ABWR-0110) had not been addressed, so it was raised again as RQ-ABWR-0876.

The direct radiation assessment for members of the public considers sources of direct radiation that are known and exist on current ABWRs. For these the direct radiation dose rate can be assessed based on operational experience. However there will be additional sources of direct radiation that will be arise during future operations in the UK. These are currently at concept stage and therefore the doses to the public cannot easily be assessed. The direct radiation sources that have not been included because they are at concept stage have not been explicitly noted in the Revision E document. We have asked for these to be listed so they can be included in the assessment during site-specific permitting, these are now in Appendix C.

The direct radiation assessment for members of the public had been updated, drawing on detailed information in a topic report on radiation protection matters. A review of the exposed groups used in the assessment of direct radiation Hitachi-GE provided may not be consistent with the groups considered for atmospheric discharges.

The verification of Revision E identified some changes in the predicted environmental concentrations that had not been documented. This was linked to model input data (marine sediment distribution coefficients (Kds)), which had been used to predict the concentrations of radionuclides in marine sediment and seawater. Therefore, an RQ was raised to establish what marine sediment Kds had been used, and which predicted environmental concentrations presented in Revision E and F reflected the Kds.

In total 4 RQs were raised on Revision E as noted in Table 5.

**Table 5. Regulatory Queries raised on the prospective dose modelling document Revision E**

RQ number	Content
RQ-ABWR-0876	UK ABWR dose modelling - Stack height reference
RQ-ABWR-0923	Topic report - public dose evaluation from direct radiation for all relevant buildings, including those at concept stage
RQ-ABWR-0924	Receptor locations – consistency between those for direct radiation assessment and the discharge assessment.
RQ-ABWR-0978	Which marine sediment Kds had been used

### 3.5.7. Detailed assessment of Revision F

Hitachi-GE submitted an assessment Revision F in July 2016. A detailed assessment was made by the Environment Agency which comprised of:

- verifying and validating the short duration releases to atmosphere
- the final independent dose assessment

The verification and validation of the assessment in Revision E was taken to apply to Revision F as no further changes to the assessment approach had been declared by Hitachi-GE.

The results of the independent dose assessment were compared with the results presented in Revision F.

The predicted doses from Hitachi-GE's Revision G (Hitachi-GE, 2017a) and our independent assessment (Environment Agency, 2016a) are summarised and presented below. Detail of the doses, including a breakdown by radionuclide, are given in Appendix B.

Revision F and G included the changes to the Hitachi-GE estimate of the discharge source terms.

Three RQs RQ-ABWR-0876, RQ-ABWR-0923 and RQ-ABWR-0924 had been answered in Revision F. Hitachi-GE has also responded to RQ-ABWR 0978 (although our RQ was submitted too late to allow Hitachi-GE's response to be included in Revision F).

### 3.5.8. Revision G of the Hitachi-GE submission on prospective dose

Hitachi-GE submitted an assessment Revision G in August 2017 (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). The submission was reviewed. The main changes were in response to RQ-ABWR-0978.

In Revision G, the sediment Kds for some of the radionuclides in the assessment of doses to non-human species had been changed from Irish Sea specific Kds to standard Kd values. This change brings the assessment of doses to non-human species into line with the assessment of doses to members of the public. The revised Kds resulted in changes to predicted concentrations of radionuclides in sediment and seawater and changes to dose rates to non-human species. The assessment of doses to members of the public were not affected as these have been derived using standard Kd values.

## 4. Results

The results of the dose assessment were compared with the dose constraints for the public set by the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 for Radioactive Substances Activities (Schedule 23) (The Stationery Office, 2016). The doses are also assessed against the dose limit for members of the public, set in EU legislation. The dose results may also be an input to decisions around use of best available techniques (BAT) and abatement options.

There are no regulatory limits and constraints for collective dose. Collective dose is mainly an input to option comparisons. In addition, collective doses can be converted to per capita doses, which can be assessed against criteria set by Public Health England (PHE).

### 4.1. Doses from the UK ABWR from Revision G

Hitachi-GE followed 3 stages in its dose assessment as outlined in our dose principles document (Environment Agency et al., 2012). The 3 stages are initial assessment, refined initial assessment and detailed assessment.

### 4.2. Stage 1 and stage 2 dose assessment

The initial assessments provide an early indication of the size of doses and generally follow a very conservative and generic approach. The dose criterion for initial assessment is 20  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Initial assessment of the impact and decisions can be made using a Stage 1 assessment. There is a need for a refined assessment at the second stage if doses are above 20  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . There is limited additional effort to refine the assessment. The second stage, therefore, is to refine the initial assessment using any more specific data related to expected dispersion or the source term. If doses from the second stage remain above 20  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , a third stage using a more detailed assessment is carried out using a more detailed model if appropriate.

Hitachi-GE reported the following doses for Stage 1 and 2 (Table 6):

**Table 6. Hitachi-GE Stage 1 and Stage 2 doses**

	Stage 1 doses ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ )	Stage 2 doses ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ )
Liquid discharges	0.0035	0.00027
Gaseous discharges	143	23.6
Direct radiation	0.9	0.9
Total	144	24.5

The main reason for the change in predicted doses between Stage 1 and Stage 2 is due to changes in the modelling assumptions for environmental dispersion. For gaseous discharges, Stage 1 assumes a ground level release for gaseous discharges. Stage 2 assumes a physical

stack height of 57m, which is modelled as an effective stack height of 19 m (See glossary for definition). Increasing stack height leads to more dilution of the release and lower air concentration at ground level at the distances of interest.

Stage 1 for liquid discharges assumes a limited local dispersion of sea water at the releases point, while Stage 2 assumes greater initial dispersion and, therefore, lower radionuclide concentrations in the water.

### 4.3. Hitachi-GE Stage 3 dose assessment

Hitachi-GE carried out a detailed assessment (Stage 3), which is described below.

The predicted dose results Hitachi-GE produced in Revision G are summarised in the tables below. The source term used and how it was derived are summarised in Appendix A.

Table 7 shows the individual doses to the person most exposed to gaseous discharges were the highest. This person was a possible resident living close to the reactor and consuming local food (Table 7, Part a). Their doses were predicted to range from 13 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . In addition, the residents were predicted to receive doses of between 0.3 to 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  from direct radiation. This gives total doses in the range of 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Gaseous discharges contribute 90% or more of the overall dose. For all age groups, the main route of exposure from this source is consuming milk and milk products. These contribute up to 45% and 37% respectively of the dose from gaseous discharges for an infant. Carbon-14 is the main radionuclide, giving up to 90% of the total dose.

Individual doses from liquid discharges Hitachi-GE assessed are much lower than those from gaseous discharges. For the most exposed group to liquid discharges who frequently use the beach and consume local seafood (Table 7, Part b) doses are in the range 0.000005 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . This group, who are also local to the reactor, are also projected to receive a dose from gaseous discharges (6-10  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ ) and between 0.3 and 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  from direct radiation. For this group, the dose from gaseous discharges and direct radiation are higher than those received from liquid discharges.

Doses from short duration gaseous releases (Table 7, part c) range from 0.016 to 0.019  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Hitachi-GE has assumed that the only radionuclides to be discharged in a short duration release under normal operation will be noble gases to the atmosphere. The assessment assumed a release lasting 24 hours, in summer, late in the growing season and before harvesting. Doses from noble gases arise mainly from external irradiation and are predicted to be low. Noble gases are not taken up in the food chain. Therefore, in this assessment, the time of year assumed for the release (that is, summer and before harvest) has no effect on the doses.

Therefore, the representative person (see glossary for definition) is a possible nearby resident exposed to gaseous discharges and direct radiation. Hitachi-GE's assessment shows that the total dose to the representative person is expected to be between 14 and 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  from one reactor.

The potential doses are well below the statutory source dose constraint for the public of 300  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , (Stationary Office, 2016) and also below the dose constraint proposed by PHE of 150  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (HPA, 2009) for new nuclear power stations.

A number of the sites listed in the Nuclear National Policy Statement (DECC, 2011a; DECC, 2011b) as potentially suitable for a new nuclear power station are adjacent to existing nuclear power stations. A detailed site-specific assessment of the radiological impact from the UK ABWR will be required for any site where an application for a permit is made by a potential future operator. This should take into account all the reactors to be installed and any adjacent nuclear site. It is very unlikely that doses at any site will exceed the site dose constraint of 500  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  or the overall dose limit for members of the public of 1000  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (1 mSv/y).

**Table 7. Summary of individual doses from a UK ABWR as reported in Hitachi-GE in Revision G (Prospective dose modelling; Hitachi-GE, 2017a)**

<b>7a Overall prospective dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}</math> to the local resident family (most exposed to gaseous discharges)</b>					
Age group	Liquid discharges	Gaseous discharges	Direct exposure	Total	Rounded* total
Adult	0.000009	12.7	0.9	13.6	14
Child	0.000010	14.0	0.5	14.5	15
Infant	0.000002	23.5	0.3	23.8	24

<b>7b Overall prospective dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}</math> to the local fishing family (most exposed to liquid discharges)</b>					
Age group	Liquid discharges	Gaseous discharges	Direct exposure	Total	Rounded* total
Adult	0.0002	6.0	0.9	6.9	7
Child	0.00006	6.7	0.5	7.1	7
Infant	0.000005	9.5	0.3	9.8	10

<b>7c Dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}</math> to the local resident family (most exposed to gaseous discharges) for a short-term discharge of gases</b>				
Age group	Cloud gamma	Cloud Beta	Total	Rounded* total
Adult	0.005	0.014	0.019	0.02
Child	0.003	0.014	0.017	0.02
Infant	0.002	0.014	0.016	0.02

\* see glossary for more details

#### 4.4. Build-up of radionuclides in the environment

Hitachi-GE has modelled the build-up of radionuclides in the environment (sea bed sediment and soil) from 60 years of discharges to the marine environment and to the air. Modelling build-up is to estimate the maximum predicted concentrations in the environment from ongoing discharges and to take them into account in the assessment. The modelling shows all radionuclides increase in concentration with time, some radionuclides such as iodine-131, tritium and zinc-65 are predicted to reach equilibrium within a few years. For marine sediment concentrations increased for longer, taking up to 50 years to reach equilibrium.

#### 4.5. Collective dose

Hitachi-GE has estimated collective doses per year of discharge for the UK, Europe and the world. Collective dose is the sum of all individual effective doses over a defined period of space and time. The calculations are made taking into account the levels of radioactivity in the environment,

including food, calculated using appropriate models, including global circulation. Results have been calculated for the UK, Europe and the world for 500 years for one year of discharge. The results are presented in Table 8. These range from 0.18 man-Sievert (manSv) per year of discharge for gaseous discharges in the UK to 30 manSv per year of discharge for the world population. Carbon-14 in gaseous discharges is the main contributor due to its global circulation. Collective doses from liquid discharges are very low, much less than 1 manSv per year of discharge.

**Table 8. Summary of collective doses (up to 500 years) manSv per year of discharge from a UK ABWR - Hitachi-GE Revision G (Prospective dose modelling; Hitachi-GE, 2017a)**

Population	Dose from liquid discharges		Dose from gaseous discharges		Total collective dose
		Rounded*		Rounded *	Rounded*
<b>UK</b>	0.0000004	0.0000004	0.43	0.4	0.4
<b>EU-12</b>	0.000002	0.000002	2.6	2.6	2.6
<b>EU-25</b>	--	--	2.9	2.9	2.9
<b>World</b>	0.00003	0.00003	29.9	30	30

\* see glossary for more details

Collective dose can be used as an input into optimisation decisions, including decisions on abatement options.

Collective dose can be used as the basis of average annual individual (per caput) doses. Average annual individual doses for a population group in the nano-Sievert per year (nSv/y) range or below can be ignored in the decision making process as the associated risks are minuscule and the contribution to total doses to individuals will be insignificant. Higher annual doses, up to say a few micro-Sievert per year ( $\mu$ Sv/y), can be considered trivial but may require some consideration, particularly if at the higher end of the range. Calculated annual average individual doses in excess of these values should prompt careful consideration of the discharge options being considered.

The Hitachi-GE assessed collective doses were converted to average dose. The average (per-caput) doses from a single UK ABWR unit are equal to 7.2 nano-Sv; 7.2 nano-Sv; 6.3 nano-Sv and 3 nano-Sv for populations of the UK, 12 European countries (EU-12); 25 European Countries (EU-25) and the world respectively.

The IAEA (IAEA, 2000) has previously stated that collective dose (manSv per year of discharge) could be added to an estimate of the relevant collective dose from occupational exposure to provide an estimate of the total collective dose. If the total collective dose is less than about 1 manSv per year of discharge, it is unlikely to be worthwhile carrying out an extensive formal optimisation study.

Some of the components of collective dose may be characterised by substantial uncertainty. In particular, when radiation exposures from very long lived nuclides persist into the far future, the assessment of the total collective dose is highly speculative and this may invalidate the results of the analysis. In optimisation, however, it is the differences between collective doses for different control options that should be considered.

## 4.6. Independent assessment



Our independent assessment included an assessment at Stage 1, Stage 2 and in detail at Stage 3. For the initial assessment at Stage 1, our assessment outcome was 143 microsievert per year ( $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ ). For the initial assessment at Stage 2, our assessment outcome was 26 microsievert per year ( $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ ). These initial assessment outcomes are dominated by discharges to atmosphere and do not include direct radiation.

For the detailed assessment at Stage 3, our independent assessment results are summarised in Table 9 (for individual doses) and Table 10 for collective doses. More details of the independent dose assessment have been published separately (Environment Agency, 2016a).

For gaseous releases, the independent assessment shows individual doses ranging from 13 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ . Total doses that include all sources of discharge (gases and liquids) and direct radiation, range between 14 and 24  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ .

**Table 9. Summary of individual doses from a UK ABWR calculated in the independent dose assessment (using data from Hitachi-GE Revision G - (prospective dose modelling; Hitachi-GE, 2017a)**

<b>9a Overall prospective dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}</math> to the local resident family (most exposed to gaseous discharges)</b>					
<b>Age group</b>	Liquid Discharges	Gaseous discharges	Direct radiation	Total	Rounded* total
<b>Adult</b>	0.000063	13.0	0.9	13.9	14
<b>Child</b>	0.000050	14.3	0.5	14.8	15
<b>Infant</b>	0.0000019	24.1	0.3	24.4	24

<b>9b Overall prospective dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}</math> to the local fishing family (most exposed to liquid discharges)</b>					
<b>Age group</b>	Liquid Discharges	Gaseous discharges	Direct exposure	Total	Rounded* total
<b>Adult</b>	0.00049	7.5	0.9	8.4	8
<b>Child</b>	0.00013	8.8	0.5	9.3	9
<b>Infant</b>	0.000025	12	0.3	12.4	12

<b>9c Dose <math>\mu\text{Sv}</math> to the local resident family (most exposed to gaseous discharges) for a short-term discharge of gases</b>						
<b>Age group</b>	Inhalation	External ground	External plume	Ingestion	Total	Rounded* total
<b>Adult daily mean</b>	0	0	0.0041	0	0.0041	0.004
<b>Child daily mean</b>	0	0	0.0028	0	0.0028	0.003
<b>Infant daily mean</b>	0	0	0.0026	0	0.0026	0.003
<b>Adult 2h peak</b>	0	0	0.002	0	0.002	0.002

\* see glossary for more details

Doses to the group most exposed to liquid discharges are lower, ranging from 8 to 12  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ . Most of the dose to the group exposed to liquid discharges was actually from gaseous discharges. Doses to this group from liquid discharges were very low - much less than 1  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ .

Doses from short duration releases to atmosphere were estimated as being between 0.002 and 0.004  $\mu\text{Sv}$  per event.

The results between the assessment Hitachi-GE provided (Hitachi-GE, 2017a) and our independent assessment (Environment Agency, 2016a) are broadly similar.

Our assessment confirms that:

- the potential dose will be below the dose constraint
- gaseous discharges are the main component of the doses, with carbon-14 the dominant nuclide
- doses from short duration releases are very low

**Table 10. Summary of collective doses from a UK ABWR (manSv per year of discharge), calculated in our independent dose assessment.**

Population	Dose from liquid discharges		Dose from gaseous discharges		Total collective dose
		Rounded*		Rounded*	Rounded*
<b>UK</b>	0.00000023	0.0000002	0.83	0.8	0.8
<b>EU-25</b>	0.0000011	0.000001	4.5	4.5	4.5
<b>World</b>	0.000026	0.00003	30	30	30

Collective dose per year of discharge due to liquid and gaseous discharges (up to 500 years)

\* see glossary for more details

The independent results in Table 10 shows collective doses ranging from 0.8 manSv per year of discharge for the UK to 30 manSv per year of discharge to the world. Most of the collective dose is from carbon-14 in gaseous discharges.

The independent collective doses were used to calculate average annual individual (per caput) doses and compared with those calculated using the Hitachi-GE's estimate of collective dose.

The independent assessment of average annual individual (per caput) doses from a single UK ABWR unit (per year of discharge) are 14 nano-Sv; 9.8 nano-Sv and 3 nano-Sv for populations of the UK, 25 European countries (EU-25) and the world respectively. These are similar to those calculated by Hitachi-GE.

## 4.7. Direct radiation doses

Estimated direct radiation doses to the public were included in Hitachi-GE dose modelling document (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). Hitachi-GE has identified the main direct radiation sources and divided them into 2 groups. One group is direct radiation sources that are known, based on measurements around Japanese ABWRs. The other group are additional direct radiation sources likely to be part of the UK ABWR design but are still at the concept stage only. In GDA, direct radiation doses have been provided for the known sources only. The sources of direct radiation at concept stage are not included in the assessment, (see also Appendix C).

## 4.8. Conclusion

1. Hitachi-GE has completed its assessment of the prospective doses to the public from discharges of gaseous radioactive waste, liquid radioactive waste and direct radiation. There have been several revisions of the assessment taking into account RQs we raised and changes to the expected discharges (source term). The assessment results are reported in Revision G (Hitachi-GE, 2017a).
2. We conclude that, for the operation of a UK ABWR at any coastal site identified as suitable for new nuclear power stations and with discharges at the limits specified by Hitachi-GE:
  - The radiation dose to people will be below the UK constraint for any single new source of 300 microsieverts per year ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ ).
  - Doses to the public from discharges and direct radiation from a single ABWR are in the range of 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Most of the dose is from gaseous discharges of carbon-14.
  - Doses to the public from aqueous liquid discharges are very low, in the range of 0.000002 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . This is because the discharge of radioactivity is very small, due to the recycling clean up and reuse of waste waters.
  - Doses from direct radiation makes a contribution of between 0.3 and 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ .
  - A detailed site-specific assessment of the radiological impact from the UK ABWR will be required for any site where an application for a permit is made by a potential future operator. This should take into account all the reactors to be installed and any adjacent nuclear site.
3. Our independent assessment considered a more restrictive coastal environment than the one Hitachi-GE used. Our assessment shows that the low levels of radioactivity in aqueous liquid discharges from the UK ABWR leads to low doses to the public in an environment with restricted dispersion.
4. Doses from our independent dose assessment are similar to those from Hitachi-GE (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). They range from 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , mostly from gaseous discharges.
5. Our independent assessment also shows very low doses from liquid discharges. The group most exposed to liquid discharges receives more dose from gaseous discharges and direct radiation than from liquid discharges.
6. The assessments show that most of the dose from discharge is from gaseous discharges of carbon-14. Therefore, we have included an assessment finding in our assessment of BAT (Environment Agency, 2017b) that consideration should be given to the current and future options for the abatement of carbon-14 in gaseous discharges.

# 5. Compliance with Environment Agency requirements

**Table 11. Compliance with Environment Agency requirements**

P&ID Table 1 Section or REP	Compliance comments
REPs:	
Fundamental Principle E – Protecting human health and the environment SEDP1- General RSR Principle for siting new facilities	We have produced a separate assessment report (Environment Agency 2017) on the generic site Hitachi-GE proposed (Hitachi-GE, 2017b) and used in its assessment.
SEDP2 - Movement of radioactive material in the environment	The dose assessment includes information on the expected levels of radionuclides in the environment with time. The movement of air around the site and the movement of radionuclides in air is assumed to occur relatively quickly. Modelling of continuous discharges and short duration releases to atmosphere are also made, which provide an indication of the movement of radioactive material through the environment
RPDP2 - Dose limits and constraints - Radiation doses to individual people shall be below the relevant dose limits and constraints	RPDP2 has been met by the results of Hitachi-GE’s prospective assessment and is confirmed by our independent assessment, verification and validation activity.
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	RPDP4 has been met by Hitachi-GE’s prospective assessment and is confirmed by our independent assessment, verification and validation activity.
P&ID Section 7 A prospective radiological assessment at the proposed limits for discharges and for any on-site incineration	Hitachi-GE carried out an assessment that included assessing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• annual dose to the most exposed members of the public for liquid discharges</li> <li>• annual dose to the most exposed members of the public for gaseous discharges (on-site incineration is not 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 members of the public</li> </ul>

P&ID Table 1 Section or REP	Compliance comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• annual dose to the representative person 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>• 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> <li>• collective dose up to 500 years to the UK, European and world populations</li> </ul> <p>The models used to calculate the doses are described and the reasons why the models are appropriate. The data and assumptions used as input to the models are set out, with reasoning.</p>

## 6. Public comments and our responses

As of the end of 08 July 2016, we had received no public comments on the expected doses to the public from the UK-ABWR assessed under GDA.

A public consultation was held between December 2016 and March 2017 on the assessment made by the Environment Agency of the UK ABWR. The comments made are the responses to them from the Environment Agency and are summarised in Appendix 7 of the decision document. The comments on the public dose assessment and the responses to them from the Environment Agency are summarised in Table 12. These responses reflect broadly Appendix 7 of the decision document, but have been expanded on in some cases in Table 12.

Table 12 - Responses to points raised by individuals and organisations on doses to the public during the public consultation.

<b>ABWR-03 Nuclear Free Local Authorities (NFLA)</b>			
<b>Part</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Further information</b>
<b>g</b>	<p>In Section 10 of their response, NFLA notes that the discharge data are not based on empirical data and is reliant of modelled data. NFLA raised concerned that as there is no empirical data, discharges and impact cannot be assessed.</p> <p>NFLA requested that where data cannot be acquired, it was explained how the following were calculated: discharges, environmental concentrations and the impact for each and every nuclide and how dose can be verified prior to discharges occurring.</p>	<p>The environmental levels from discharges are predicted using dispersion models. Dispersion models used were created with input from environmental monitoring and measurements (empirical data). Data used in the models are also empirically based. The data used in the modelling has been verified against measurements. The data and modelling used are reviewed periodically and up to date data published by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). UK assessments are based on the IAEA data. The modelling takes into account radioelement environmental behaviour and radioactive decay and progeny ingrowth. Because of the empirical (measurement) basis of the data used, the model outcomes are partially verified. The environmental levels will be checked on by a programme of environmental monitoring.</p>	<p>Assessment Report 05; Section 13 of the decision document;</p> <p>Appendix 7 of the decision document.</p>
<b>ABWR-05 Berkeley Site Stakeholder Group</b>			
<b>h</b>	<p>In response to consultation question 9 (dose), the respondents recognised that the radiological impact of discharges is low and that the resultant doses are well below any constraint. The respondents requested a layman's interpretation to be given, that is an additional "n%" over natural background levels.</p>	<p>The expected doses to the public can be compared with background dose rate from natural sources of radioactivity. Natural background dose rates include cosmic rays, doses from naturally occurring radionuclides in foods, doses from rocks and soil and doses from radon gas. Natural background dose rates are affected by underlying geology which varies across the UK. Levels of radon gas also vary and make a big contribution to doses in parts of the UK. Natural dose rates range from 1.5 mSv/y to 8 mSv/y across the UK. The UK average is 2.2 mSv/y.</p> <p>In Wales the dose rate has been assessed by county and ranges from 1.6 mSv/y in Mid Glamorgan to 3.0 mSv/y in Clwyd. In Gwynedd the dose is 2.8 mSv/y. In Gloucestershire (near</p>	<p>NRPB document R263</p>



		<p>Oldbury), the background dose is 2.5 mSv/y.</p> <p>The predicted doses from a UK ABWR are up to 0.025 mSv/y. This assessed dose is therefore below the dose constraint of 0.3 mSv/y and well below the range of background dose rates for the UK. Most of the dose from the UK ABWR is from carbon-14 from gaseous discharges. carbon-14 is generated in the reactor by activation of carbon-13, N-14 and O-17. Carbon-14 also occurs naturally in large quantities in the environment, as a result of neutrons of cosmic origin interacting with N-14 in the upper atmosphere.</p>	
i	<p>In response to consultation question 15 (water abstraction), the respondents highlighted that the assumption of seawater cooling is not applicable to Oldbury and that cooling towers will be required. The respondents queried what impacts this would have on the generic design and whether this would result in any greater risk to people and environment?</p>	<p>The assessment of doses to the public provided by Hitachi-GE considered siting of one ABWR at a generic site using direct sea water cooling, as it would be for Wylfa.A. Discharges of liquid radioactive wastes have been modelled for the marine conditions around Wylfa. The Environment Agency made an independent assessment of doses to the public – for one ABWR sited at a generic site more representative of Oldbury. In the Environment Agency assessment, liquid discharges have been modelled for the Severn Estuary close to Oldbury. Doses from liquid discharges are very low for discharges to either the marine environment near Wylfa or the Severn Estuary near Oldbury. The doses are low because the liquid discharges are very low. Liquid discharges are low because most of the reactor water is recycled in the UK ABWR design. The additional dispersion of mixing discharges in the large volume of cooling water discharges to the environment is not considered in the modelling. Allowing for cooling water discharges as part of the modelling may reduce the predicted doses by increasing the amount of dispersion.</p>	<p>Independent dose assessment report</p>
<b>ABWR-14 Individual 7</b>			
d	<p>A request was made for Natural Resources Wales to prepare and present dose estimates for the population in Wales from a UK ABWR based on a Welsh generic</p>	<p>This consultation is for the draft Natural Resources Wales and Environment Agency assessment findings of the generic reactor design for England and Wales. It is not a site-specific design, however a nuclear operator (Horizon</p>	<p>Section 13 of the decision document;</p>

	<p>site, as well as dispersion charts for routine and abnormal radioactive discharges. Comment was made that such data should be provided to the public directly.</p>	<p>Nuclear Power) is proposing to use the design (if approved by regulators) at 2 sites, one at Wylfa in Wales and one at Oldbury in England. The generic design provided to Natural Resources Wales and the Environment Agency includes estimated doses based on a generic design as this GDA is for a non-site specific generic site.</p> <p>We have conducted our own assessments of the estimated doses and have published these in the draft assessment findings. In addition as part of our normal process under assessment of a generic design, we arranged to have the estimated doses provided by Hitachi-GE independently assessed, the results of which are also provided</p> <p>If we receive any applications from an operator for environmental permits to operate with respect to a site in Wales, we shall undertake a rigorous permit application determination process which shall include an assessment of site-specific estimated doses presented by an applicant. This information will be made publicly available by the applicant as part of the process. We also will provide the results of our own and independent assessments of the estimated dose as part of our decision. We shall also publicly consult on our draft decision.</p>	<p>Independent dose assessment.</p>
<b>ABWR-33 The Food Standards Agency (FSA)</b>			
<p><b>c</b></p>	<p>In response to consultation question 13 (impact of radioactive waste) comment is made that the consumption data used in the GDA does not reflect the current national published data. The FSA commented that they would consider using the following data on consumption for generic assessments: National Diet and Nutrition Survey: results from Years 1 to 4 (combined) of the rolling programme for 2008 and 2009 to 2011 and 2012. FSA identified that this is available online at the following location:</p>	<p>For GDA, the assessment uses a generic site. The generic site reflects the environmental aspects of the sites at which a power station might be built. A generic site is defined in terms of generic non-site-specific data. The assessment of the impacts at the generic site makes use of the relevant parts of the dose principles document.</p> <p>Our assessment used published Public Health England habits data. Our approach was consistent with guidance presented by the National Dose Assessment Working Group (NDAWG). In summary the NDAWG guidance suggests that the so called top 2 approach can be used for generic assessments. The top 2 approach</p>	<p>Section 13 of the decision document.</p> <p>Independent dose assessment report.</p> <p>Dose principles document.</p>

	<p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-diet-and-nutrition-survey-results-from-years-1-to-4-combined-of-the-rolling-programme-for-2008-and-2009-to-2011-and-2012">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-diet-and-nutrition-survey-results-from-years-1-to-4-combined-of-the-rolling-programme-for-2008-and-2009-to-2011-and-2012</a> Bates B, Cox L, Nicholson S, Page P, Prentice A, Steer T, Swan G (2016). National Diet and Nutrition Survey Results from Years 5 and 6 (combined) of the Rolling Programme (2012/2013 – 2013/2014). FSA identified that this is available online at the following location:: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-results-from-years-5-and-6-combined">https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/ndns-results-from-years-5-and-6-combined</a></p>	<p>requires information on the 95th or 97.5th percentile consumption rates, which are not presented in these national diet surveys (NDS).</p> <p>If an application for a permit to operate a nuclear power station is received, a site-specific assessment of the impact will be required. All nuclear sites have site-specific habit data published which will be used for permitting. For the site-specific assessment we expect Horizon Nuclear Power to follow NDAWG guidance. Environment Agency and Natural Resources Wales will make their own assessment and will also use NDAWG guidance and local habits data where available.</p>	
<b>d</b>	<p>The FSA commented that, in considering the distance from the site of the representative groups, the assessment has used a range of distances and that the choice of these locations is unclear. The FSA further commented that the assessment of the food pathway considered that food production is at 500m, when a more pessimistic assumption and in some cases more realistic assumption is 100m, for example there is food production within 100m of one of the proposed sites, Wylfa.</p>	<p>In respect to food locations, the baseline assessment is for a generic site, where food production locations are not known. There is a balance between the food production locations, availability of suitable land and suitable area of land, maximum ground level air concentrations, and release heights.</p> <p>The dose principles document, of which the Food Standards Agency is joint author, has been followed. The dose principles document recommends consideration of sufficient land to allow sufficient food production that can be sustained. The dose principles document does not recommend an assessment at the point of maximum air concentration and ground deposition. The point of maximum air concentration and ground deposition may be fairly localised and cover a small area. It is unlikely that the point of maximum air concentration and deposition will meet the approach suggested in the dose principles document.</p> <p>For a generic site assessment and for screening assessments the location of food production is normally assumed to average around 500m from the release point. The release point itself could be several hundred metres inside the site boundary. Therefore any locations at which food could be produced could be close to the site boundary and also spread some distance from the</p>	<p>Section 13 of the decision document.</p> <p>Dose principles document.</p>

		<p>boundary and release point. A significant amount of land is required to sustain a reasonable amount of food production. Therefore 500m is a reasonable average distance to represent food production - between 300m and 700m from the release point. The actual food production locations are site-specific and will be identified and assessed on an appropriate basis during site permitting.</p>	
<b>e</b>	<p>The FSA stated that it is unclear whether the assessment has considered the maximum deposition and air concentration locations to work out the activity concentration in food and other pathways. The FSA recommended that for a generic assessment the maximum deposition and air concentration outside the expected site perimeter would provide the most conservative approach. Further comment was made that this could be as close in as 100m that was suggested in the IRAT assessment tool or further out.</p>	<p>Our reply to Point d above explains the overall approach taken to food production assessment and explains why using the point of maximum air concentration and deposition is unlikely to be appropriate for the assessment at GDA.</p>	
<b>f</b>	<p>The FSA commented that when considering the modelling of the gaseous discharges, the document is unclear on the reasons for the assumptions used and the weather patterns for the generic site.</p>	<p>We agree that there are always opportunities to improve the explanation. Assumptions that affect gaseous discharge include stack height and weather patterns. Stack height was selected to be representative of the UK ABWR stack protrusion above the reactor building, taking into account the effect of the wake of the building and we consider the selected height appropriate (see Section 13). On weather patterns, the meteorological data assumptions are described in assessment report AR08. In modelling gaseous discharge, Hitachi-GE use a recognised system of categorising the stability of atmospheric conditions. The range of categories used (for different stable and unstable conditions and the proportions of each) are representative of coastal conditions and we consider this appropriate for a generic site at GDA. For site-specific permitting, it is</p>	<p>Appendix 7 of the decision document. NRPB Report R-91.</p>

		expected that site representative meteorological data will be used.	
<b>g</b>	The FSA queried whether there is a national representative windrose for the 'annual wind information' to do a generic design assessment.	In respect to atmospheric dispersion for the UK, this divides the UK atmosphere into 8 stability categories, with different boundary layers and wind speeds. Some categories have a greater dispersive effect and lead to lower air concentrations at ground level. Each category has a frequency of occurrence, which varies around the UK. The assessment made by Hitachi-GE uses data for a generic site that is based on Wylfa, and therefore uses data from weather patterns likely to be experienced near Wylfa. However, a generic site by definition does not have a specific windrose, so therefore a uniform windrose is likely to be appropriate. The independent assessment made by the Environment Agency uses weather patterns based on a generic site similar to Oldbury and a uniform windrose. We would expect site-specific data including site windrose data to be used in any assessment for a permit application for a specific site.	Section 13 of the decision document Appendix 7 of the decision document Independent dose assessment report NRPB Report R-91
<b>ABWR-35 Public Health England (PHE)</b>			
<b>c</b>	In response to consultation question 13 (impact of radioactive discharges), PHE commented that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) it believes that the general approach and the methodology adopted by the Environment Agency in assessing the radiological impact of radioactive discharges are reasonable. PHE is therefore confident that the results of this assessment are sound and robust; PHE agrees with the preliminary conclusions reached by the Environment Agency.</li> <li>(ii) A review has been carried out of Chapter 13 of the Environment Agency: GDA consultation document for the UK ABWR. In addition, the supporting documents</li> </ul>	c(i), c(ii) and c(iii). Noted. c(iv). The input data (meteorological data, habits and assumptions about food production) are found in the detailed technical appendices – i.e. Appendix B, C and D of Hitachi-GE's submission (Hitachi-GE, 2017e). The independent dose assessment undertaken by the Environment Agency gives input data including meteorological data, habits data and land use data in the appendices to the independent dose assessment Appendices C, D, E, F, G and H (Environment Agency, 2016c). We have not made any specific comments on the suitability of the input data in the consultation. We have realised that there were several inconsistencies between the results given in assessment report 09 (AR09) and the consultation document itself. These were induced by changes made by Hitachi-GE to the source term	Section 13 of the decision document Appendix 7 of the decision document Independent dose assessment



	<p>AR09 – Assessment of radiological impacts on members of the public and AR10 - Assessment of radiological impacts on non-human species have been considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(iii) Chapter 13 of the Environment Agency: GDA consultation document for the UK ABWR is clearly laid out with the aims of the assessment identified and the generic site concept explained. Radiological impact assessments have been carried out to verify and validate the dose calculations submitted by Hitachi-GE and in addition independent assessments have been performed for comparison. Individual and collective doses have been calculated to humans and dose rates calculated for non-human biota. The results of the various assessments are in general agreement and lead to the conclusion that the impact of gaseous and liquid discharges at the proposed discharge limits will not give rise to doses that exceed the dose constraint or limit for humans or the dose rate criterion for non-human biota.</li> <li>(iv) Full details of the input data used in the dose assessment calculations are not provided in these three reports. For example, meteorological data, assumptions about food production areas and a full description of habit data for the local population are not available. It has therefore not been possible to comment on the suitability of assumptions and data that have gone into the</li> </ul>	<p>in July 2016 in Draft F. In the July update, increases in discharges of some radionuclides were made. The increased discharges lead to increases in doses by up to 4 µSv/y. The assessment report AR09 was updated with the revised discharges and doses. However, not all the revised doses were transferred into the summary tables of the consultation document itself. Therefore, there are some inconsistencies. However the differences between AR-09 and the consultation document were very small and do not alter the provisional conclusions. The decision document has been updated and now carries the corrected data. The decision document (which reflects the consultation document)</p> <p>c(v), c(vi), c(vii), c(viii), c(ix) and c(x). This decision document has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>c(xi). We have amended this decision document to include a footnote for + (relating to noble gases).</p> <p>c(xii). A footnote has been added to identify age group in this decision document.</p> <p>c(xiii). Doses to foetus were not calculated in Stage 3. This is because doses to the foetus are higher than other age groups for a small number of radionuclides. The nuclides that affect the foetus more are not in the discharges from the UK ABWR.</p> <p>c(xiv). This decision document has been amended accordingly.</p> <p>c(xv), c(xvi) and c(xvii). The physical height assumed was 57 m (based on Hitachi-GE information). The effective height for a 57 m stack is 19 m and the assessment was based on the 19 m height, whilst in Stage 2 the nearest height of 20 m was used. Hitachi-GE used an effective height of 19 m for its assessment of doses to non-human organisms. Therefore the assessments are consistent.</p> <p>c(xviii). The approaches adopted to the assessment that Hitachi-GE provided (Hitachi-GE, 2017e) and our</p>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>dose assessments. It is also not clear, from Chapter 13 alone, whether the doses calculated are to a particular age group or an amalgamation of doses to different age groups. There appear to be some inconsistencies between Chapter 3 and AR09.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (v) Table 13.1 in Chapter 13 in the table header should dosea should be dose(a)?</li> <li>• (vi) Table 13.1 in Chapter 13 gives Stage 1 Hitachi-GE dose as 143 <math>\mu\text{Sv/y}</math> – if this includes direct radiation I think it should be 144 as in AR09.</li> <li>• (vii) Table 13.1 in Chapter 13 - Table footer could clarify that “Doses to those most exposed to aqueous liquid discharges were very low in the range 0.000005-0.0002 <math>\mu\text{Sv/y}</math>”</li> <li>• (viii) Table 13.2 in Chapter 13 - Total dose from Stage 1 given as 139 <math>\mu\text{Sv/y}</math> which does not seem to be consistent with Table 13.1 or Table 6 in AR09</li> <li>• (ix) Table 13.2 in Chapter 13 - Doses from Stage 2 do not seem to be consistent with Table 6 of AR09</li> <li>• (x) Table 13.2 in Chapter 13 - Doses from aqueous discharges for Stage 3 do not seem to be consistent with Table 7b of AR09</li> <li>• (xi) Table 13.2 in Chapter 13 - Is the dose from a short duration release due entirely to cloud beta and cloud gamma exposures because source term is only noble gases? There is no note of what the + under the short duration release refers to.</li> </ul>	<p>independent assessment (Environment Agency, 2016c) are somewhat different. The outcomes are different in terms of predicted dose, but both assessments show very low doses, due to the low levels of short duration discharges of noble gases. This will be reassessed as part of the site-specific permitting.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (xii) Table 13.3 - It is noted that these doses are to the representative person and yet the doses given for Stage 3 are for different age groups (see Table 9 of AR09)</li> <li>• (xiii) Para 418 - doses to fetus are calculated but are not mentioned in note (c) of Table 13.1.</li> <li>• (xiv) Para 428 refers to the Health Protection Agency but should now refer to Public Health England</li> <li>• (xv) Para 444 - A stack height of 57 m is assumed for non-human biota and yet for humans a stack height of 20 m.</li> <li>• (xvi) If human and non-human assessments are to be integrated they need to be consistent.</li> <li>• (xvii) Para 445 - What was the realistic stack height used 57 m or 20 m.</li> <li>• (xviii) Para 458 - Are the results from the independent assessment of short duration releases (Table 9c of AR09) consistent with the Hitachi-GE assessment?</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

## 7. Conclusion

We conclude that, for the operation of a UK ABWR at any coastal site identified as suitable for new nuclear power stations and with discharges at the limits specified by Hitachi-GE:

- The radiation dose to people will be below the UK constraint for any single new source of 300 microsieverts per year ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ ).
- Doses to the public from discharges and direct radiation from a single ABWR are in the range of 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . Most of the dose is from Carbon-14 in the gaseous discharges.
- Doses to the public from aqueous liquid discharges are very low, in the range of 0.000002 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ . This is because the discharge of radioactivity is very small, due to the recycling clean up and reuse of waste waters.
- Doses from direct radiation makes a contribution of between 0.3 and 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ .

- Hitachi-GE has made an adequate assessment of the impact of the gaseous and aqueous liquid discharges to the environment.
- Our assessment was able to verify and validate Hitachi-GE's assessment.

Our independent assessment considered a more restrictive coastal environment than the one Hitachi-GE used. Our assessment shows that the low levels of radioactivity in aqueous liquid discharges from the UK ABWR leads to low doses to the public in an environment with restricted dispersion.

Doses from our independent dose assessment are similar to those from Hitachi-GE (Hitachi-GE, 2017a). They range from 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ , mostly from carbon-14 in gaseous discharges.

Our independent assessment also shows very low doses from liquid discharges. The group most exposed to liquid discharges receives more dose from gaseous discharges and direct radiation than from liquid discharges.

The assessments show that most of the dose from discharge is from gaseous discharges of carbon-14. Therefore, we have included an assessment finding as part of our assessment of BAT (Environment Agency, 2017b) that consideration should be given to the current and future options for the abatement of carbon-14 in gaseous discharges.

There are no GDA Issues or Assessment Findings (AFs) arising from the prospective assessment of doses to the public. This is because the expected doses to the public from discharges and direct radiation are well below relevant dose criteria.

In line with our usual procedures we will require a detailed site-specific impact assessment to be carried out during the site-specific permitting stage. The site-specific assessment should consider the actual environmental characteristics of the proposed site; the number of UK ABWR units that will be present and discharges from any other sources of radioactivity.

The site specific assessment will be to demonstrate that doses to members of the public and non-human species from the UK ABWR will be as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) and below relevant dose constraint and dose limits. Comparison against the dose limit should be carried out at site-specific permitting when contributions from all sources of radiation can be included.

We have not made the need for a site-specific assessment a GDA finding because a site-specific assessment is a requirement of the permitting process.

# References

---

<b>Author</b>	<b>Reference</b>
CERC, 2012	Cambridge Environmental Research Consultants (2012), Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System, Version 5, (ADMS V5).
BERR, 2008	Meeting the Energy Challenge. A White Paper on Nuclear Power, BERR, January 2008. <a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100512172052/http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/what_we_do/uk_supply/energy_mix/nuclear/white_paper_08/white_paper_08.aspx">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100512172052/http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/what_we_do/uk_supply/energy_mix/nuclear/white_paper_08/white_paper_08.aspx</a>
DECC, 2011a	National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6). Volume I of II. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37051/2009-nps-for-nuclear-volumel.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37051/2009-nps-for-nuclear-volumel.pdf</a>
DECC, 2011b	National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6). Volume II of II, Annexes. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37052/1943-nps-nuclear-power-annex-volII.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/37052/1943-nps-nuclear-power-annex-volII.pdf</a>
Environment Agency, 2010	Radioactive Substances Regulation – Environmental Principles, Regulatory Guidance Series No RSR1, Environment Agency 2010, Version 2.
Environment Agency et al., 2012	Environment Agency, Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Northern Ireland Environment Agency, Food Standards Agency and Health Protection Agency, 2012. Principles for the assessment of prospective public doses arising from Authorised Discharges of Radioactive Waste to the Environment (Issue 2).
Environment Agency, 2016a	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Independent dose assessment.
Environment Agency, 2016b	Process and information document for generic assessment of candidate nuclear power plant designs, Version 3, Environment Agency, 2016. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-of-candidate-nuclear-power-plant-designs">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/assessment-of-candidate-nuclear-power-plant-designs</a>
Environment Agency, 2017a	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Assessment of generic site description for the Hitachi-GE UK ABWR design, AR08.
Environment Agency, 2017b	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Assessment of best available techniques for the Hitachi-GE UK ABWR design, AR03.

---

Author	Reference
Environment Agency, 2017c	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Assessment of gaseous radioactive waste for the Hitachi-GE UK ABWR design, AR04.
Environment Agency, 2017d	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Assessment of aqueous radioactive waste and spent fuel for the Hitachi-GE UK ABWR design, AR05.
Environment Agency, 2017e	Generic design assessment of the UK ABWR - Assessment of solid radioactive waste for the Hitachi-GE UK ABWR design, AR06.
EU, 1996	<p>1996 Basic Safety Standards Directive (BSSD) of 13 May 1996 laying down basic safety standards for the protection of the health of workers and the general public against the dangers arising from ionizing radiation. (96/29/Euratom).</p> <p>Directive 2013/59/Euratom will repeal the 1996 Directive by 6 February 2018</p>
EU, 2013	<p>Basic Safety Standards Directive (BSSD) of 5 December 2013 laying down basic safety standards for protection against the dangers arising from exposure to ionising radiation, (2013/59/Euratom)</p> <p>This directive repeals Directives 89/618/Euratom, 90/641/Euratom, 96/29/Euratom, 97/43/Euratom and 2003/122/Euratom</p> <p><a href="https://osha.europa.eu/en/legislation/directives/directive-2013-59-euratom-protection-against-ionising-radiation">https://osha.europa.eu/en/legislation/directives/directive-2013-59-euratom-protection-against-ionising-radiation</a></p>
Health Protection Agency, 2009	Application of the 2007 recommendations of the ICRP to the UK. Advice from the Health Protection Agency. Documents of the Health Protection Agency. Radiation, Chemical and Environmental Hazards, July 2009.
Hitachi-GE, 2017a	Prospective dose modelling. GA91-9901-0026-00001 Revision G. Hitachi-GE, August 2017.
Hitachi-GE, 2017b	Generic site description. GA91-9901-0020-00001 Revision F. Hitachi-GE, August 2017.
Hitachi-GE, 2017c	Quantification of discharges and limits. GA91-9901-0025-00001 Revision G. Hitachi-GE, August 2017.
IAEA, 2000	Regulatory control of radioactive discharges to the environment safety standards series no. Ws-g-2.3 International Atomic Energy Agency Vienna, 2000.
Smith et al., 2009	Smith J.G. and Simmonds J.R. (2009) The methodology for assessing the radiological consequences of routine releases of radionuclides to the environment used in PC-CREAM 08. Health Protection Agency, report HPA-RPD-058.

---

<b>Author</b>	<b>Reference</b>
The Stationery Office, 2016	Environmental Protection, England and Wales; the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016. Schedule 23 Radioactive Substances Activities Statutory Instruments No.1154.
US EPA, 2004	US Environmental Protection Agency (2004). User's guide for the AMS/EPA regulatory model – AERMOD.

---



# List of abbreviations

---

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Details</b>
ABWR	Advanced Boiling Water Reactor
ADMS	Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System
ALARA	As low as reasonably achievable
BAT	Best available techniques
GDA	Generic design assessment
GEP	Generic environmental permit
HVAC	Heating ventilation and air conditioning system
OG	Off-gas system
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation
P&ID	Process and information document
PHE	Public Health England
REPs	Radioactive Substances Regulation Environmental Principles
RI	Regulatory Issue
RO	Regulatory Observation
RQ	Regulatory Query
TGS	Turbine gland steam system
TSC	Technical specialist contractor – employed by the regulator to provide assessment support
UK ABWR	UK Advanced Boiling Water Reactor

---

# Glossary

---

<b>Word/Phrase</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
Collective dose	The sum of the individual doses received by a specified population from exposure to a specified source of radiation in a given time period. Typically man-Sv truncated at 500 years from a discharge lasting for one year.
Direct radiation	Radiation emitted from fixed structures containing radioactivity and/or radioactive sources on a site, including the reactor circuit; source stores; spent fuel stores; radioactive waste stores.
Effective stack height (frequently used in the modelling of gaseous releases)	A representation of the release height of gases to atmosphere, which, where relevant, maybe be affected by (or may take into account) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the physical height of the release point;</li><li>- the wake effects or downdraught effects of nearby buildings of a similar height to or higher than the stack</li><li>- the exit velocity of the discharged gases</li><li>- the temperature of the discharged gases</li><li>- geography/terrain (hills or valleys nearby)</li></ul>
Gaussian (plume) model	One of the oldest (from around 1936) and commonly used model types for atmospheric dispersion of pollutants. It assumes that the air pollutant dispersion has a Gaussian distribution, meaning that the pollutant distribution has a normal probability distribution. Gaussian (plume) models are most often used for predicting the dispersion of continuous, buoyant air pollution plumes originating from ground-level or elevated sources. Gaussian models may also be used for predicting the dispersion of non-continuous air pollution plumes (called puff models). The primary algorithm used in Gaussian modelling is the Generalised Dispersion Equation For A Continuous Point-Source Plume.
Pasquill stability category (related to modelling dispersion of discharges to atmosphere)	An historically common method of categorising the amount of atmospheric turbulence present (dating from 1961). Atmospheric turbulence was categorised into 6 stability classes (A, B, C, D, E and F) with class A being the most unstable or most turbulent class, and class F the most stable or least turbulent class.
Physical stack height (sometimes used in the modelling of gaseous releases)	The height of the top of the stack from which gaseous releases may occur relative to the ground.
Radioactive Progeny	The radioactive isotope that is the product atom formed during the radioactive decay. Also called radioactive daughter. In some cases the product atom may not be radioactive

---

---

<b>Word/Phrase</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
Representative person	Characterised individual, either hypothetical or specific, whose dose can be used for determining compliance with the relevant dose constraint. The representative person is 'an individual receiving a dose that is representative of the more highly exposed individuals in the population.' This term is the equivalent of and replaces the average member of the critical group. In selecting the characteristics including habits of the representative person, 3 important concepts should be borne in mind: reasonableness, sustainability, and homogeneity.
Rounded (number)	In this report estimated doses may be calculated to several decimal places. This suggests the result is known to a high level of precision, which is not correct given the uncertainties in the calculation. Therefore the results may be rounded to one or 2 significant figures. The standard rounding rules for decimals have been followed.

---

# Appendix A - The UK ABWR source term used in the prospective assessment

## A.1 Introduction

The prospective assessment of doses depends on the expected discharges of radioactivity, the 'source term for discharges', particularly the radionuclides, their form and quantity. The source term for discharges is derived from considering how radionuclides originate in the reactor and how they transfer to the various waste streams.

## A.2. Liquid discharges

Liquid discharges are predicted to be very low (Table A1). The proposed discharge limits for the majority of radionuclides are less than 1 MBq/y, with the exception of tritium (0.76 TBq/y) and iron-55 (9.4 MBq/y). Overall, the low discharges resulted in low predicted doses.

**Table A1. Liquid discharges used in Revision F and G of the dose assessment**

Nuclide	Proposed discharge limits Bq/y	% of total
Ag-110m	5.70E+00	0.0000%
Am-241	1.10E-01	0.0000%
Ba-140	6.20E+03	0.0000%
Ce-141	4.50E+04	0.0000%
Ce-144	2.40E+05	0.0000%
Cm-242	2.10E+00	0.0000%
Cm-243	4.90E-03	0.0000%
Cm-244	4.50E-01	0.0000%
Co-58	8.20E+04	0.0000%
Co-60	8.20E+05	0.0001%
Cr-51	3.70E+04	0.0000%
Cs-134	5.70E+03	0.0000%
Cs-137	6.60E+03	0.0000%
Fe-55	9.40E+06	0.0012%
Fe-59	2.10E+04	0.0000%
H-3	7.60E+11	99.9983%
I-131	6.00E+04	0.0000%
La-140	7.00E+03	0.0000%
Mn-54	4.00E+05	0.0001%
Nb-95	1.80E+05	0.0000%

Nuclide	Proposed discharge limits Bq/y	% of total
Ni-63	8.60E+05	0.0001%
Pu-238	3.60E+00	0.0000%
Pu-239	5.70E-01	0.0000%
Pu-240	9.00E-01	0.0000%
Ru-103	2.70E+04	0.0000%
Ru-106	1.90E+04	0.0000%
Sb-122	1.20E+02	0.0000%
Sb-124	5.30E+04	0.0000%
Sb-125	8.20E+04	0.0000%
Sr-89	9.00E+03	0.0000%
Sr-90	4.50E+03	0.0000%
Te-123m	6.20E+01	0.0000%
Zn-65	1.10E+05	0.0000%
Zr-95	8.20E+04	0.0000%
Total		100.0000%

### A.3. Gaseous discharges

Gaseous discharges are predicted to be low (Table A2). Discharges were above 1 TBq for only three radionuclides, argon-41, carbon-14 and tritium.

**Table A2. Gaseous source term used in Revision F and G of the dose assessment**

Nuclide	Proposed discharge limits Bq/y	% of total
Ag-110m	3.90E+01	0.0000%
Am-241	6.60E-04	0.0000%
Ar-41	5.20E+12	30.3815%
Ba-140	3.50E+04	0.0000%
C-14	1.70E+12	9.9324%
Ce-141	4.90E+04	0.0000%
Ce-144	4.50E+04	0.0000%
Cm-242	4.90E-01	0.0000%
Cm-243	4.90E-05	0.0000%
Cm-244	6.20E-03	0.0000%
Co-58	1.50E+05	0.0000%

Nuclide	Proposed discharge limits Bq/y	% of total
Co-60	1.50E+05	0.0000%
Cr-51	1.30E+05	0.0000%
Cs-134	9.40E+03	0.0000%
Cs-137	5.70E+03	0.0000%
Fe-59	2.40E+04	0.0000%
H-3	1.00E+13	58.4259%
I-131	3.20E+08	0.0019%
I-132	1.10E+08	0.0006%
I-133	7.30E+07	0.0004%
I-135	4.30E+07	0.0003%
Kr-85	1.30E+09	0.0076%
Kr-85m	1.00E+10	0.0584%
Kr-87	9.80E+03	0.0000%
Kr-88	9.30E+08	0.0054%
La-140	4.10E+04	0.0000%
Mn-54	9.00E+04	0.0000%
Nb-95	1.10E+05	0.0000%
Pu-238	9.40E-03	0.0000%
Pu-239	1.20E-03	0.0000%
Pu-240	1.90E-03	0.0000%
Sb-122	4.90E+02	0.0000%
Sb-124	4.90E+04	0.0000%
Sb-125	9.80E+03	0.0000%
Sr-89	4.10E+04	0.0000%
Sr-90	2.60E+03	0.0000%
Xe-131m	2.90E+09	0.0169%
Xe-133	2.00E+11	1.1685%
Xe-133m	1.80E+07	0.0001%
Zn-65	4.10E+04	0.0000%
Zr-95	5.30E+04	0.0000%
Total	1.71E+13	100.0000%



Table A2 shows the percentage contributions of each radionuclide discharges to the total in terms of activity. Tritium is the main nuclide discharged in terms of quantity, making up 58% of the total discharge, argon-41 at 30% and carbon-14 at 10% are also important in terms of quantity.

## A.4 Short duration releases to the atmosphere

Radioactive discharges to the atmosphere may not always be made at a constant rate. Fluctuations and variations can occur within foreseeable margins. Fluctuations may be caused by the occasional failed fuel cladding or other events such as start up or shut down. The expected discharges are short duration enhanced discharges of noble gases released from fuel through damaged cladding. The expected enhanced discharges are shown in Table A3.

**Table A3. Gaseous discharges of short duration used in Revision F and G of the dose assessment**

Radionuclide	Activity discharged in 24h (Bq)	Fraction of proposed annual limit
Kr-85	1.10E+09	0.85
Kr-85m	5.50E+09	0.55
Kr-87	5.00E+03	0.51
Kr-88	5.50E+08	0.59
Xe-131m	2.60E+09	0.9
Xe-133	1.80E+11	0.9
Xe-133m	1.40E+07	0.78

# Appendix B – Detail of predicted doses

## B.1 Hitachi-GE assessment Revision F

The Hitachi-GE assessment shows that individual doses from gaseous discharges were the highest to residents living close to the reactor and consuming local food.

For the Stage 3 assessment, Hitachi-GE's estimate of doses from gaseous discharges were predicted to range from 12.7 to 23.5  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (Table 7a).

In addition, the residents were predicted to receive doses of between 0.3 and 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  from direct radiation.

In addition residents were predicted to receive very small doses from liquid discharges in the range 0.000002 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (Table 7a and Table 7b).

This gives total doses (from gases, liquids and direct radiation) in the range from 14 to 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (Table 7a). The highest dose of 24  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  is to infants aged 1 year. Children receive a dose of 15  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  and adults a dose of 14  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ .

For the infant age group, doses from gaseous discharges are 23.5  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  – (98.7% of the overall dose). Direct radiation doses to infants was 0.3  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$  (1.3% of the overall dose).

Doses to infants from aqueous liquid discharges is very small (much less than 1%).

For infants, the main radionuclides are from gaseous discharges - carbon-14 (90.6% of the dose) followed by iodine-131 (4.7%) and tritium (3.9%). The main dose pathways are terrestrial foods affected by gaseous discharges: consumption of milk and milk products (82% of the dose). Non-food pathways contribute 8.2% of the dose.

For the adult age group, gaseous discharges contribute about 94% of the overall dose. For this age group, the main route of exposure from this source is also due to carbon-14, which dominates through the consumption of milk and milk products.

A breakdown of doses by pathway and by the main radionuclide for infants are shown in Table B1 and Table B2.

**Table B1. Doses to infants from gaseous discharges by radionuclide**

Nuclide	Dose $\mu\text{Sv/y}$	Percentage
Ar-41	1.26E-01	0.54%
C-14	2.13E+01	90.63%
H-3	9.23E-01	3.93%
I-131	1.10E+00	4.68%
I-133	3.02E-03	0.01%
Others	4.99E-02	0.21%
Total	2.35E+01	100.00%

**Table B2. Doses to infants by pathway  $\mu\text{Sv/y}$**

Radio-nuclide	Dose by pathways $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ (grouped) and by main radionuclides							Total	%
	Sub-total								
	Non ingestion*	Cow meat	Cow milk	Fruit and veg	Sheep meat	Ingestion			
Ar-41	1.26E-01	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.26E-01	0.54%	
C-14	1.68E+00	3.12E-01	1.75E+01	1.72E+00	1.16E-01	1.97E+01	2.13E+01	90.63%	
H-3	1.08E-01	6.01E-03	7.50E-01	5.69E-02	2.23E-03	8.15E-01	9.23E-01	3.93%	
I-131	4.04E-03	1.67E-03	1.08E+00	1.43E-02	7.13E-04	1.10E+00	1.10E+00	4.68%	
I-133	2.27E-04	1.14E-06	2.74E-03	4.92E-05	4.57E-07	2.79E-03	3.02E-03	0.01%	
Others	0.00E+00	5.25E-04	4.86E-02	7.08E-04	0.00E+00	4.98E-02	4.99E-02	0.21%	
Total	1.92E+00	3.20E-01	1.94E+01	1.79E+00	1.19E-01	2.16E+01	2.35E+01	100.00%	
%	8.16%	1.36%	82.34%	7.61%	0.50%	91.82%	100.00%	100.00%	

\* Non-ingestion doses sub-total is the sum of doses from inhalation of radionuclides in the plume; external doses from radionuclides in the plume and external doses from radionuclides deposited on the ground.

Individual doses from liquid discharges are much lower than those from gases. For the most exposed group to liquid discharges who use the beach a lot and consume local seafood (Table 7 part a), doses are in the range 0.000005 to 0.0002  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ . The highest dose from the liquid discharges is to an adult from cobalt-60 from external exposure to sediments.

This group also live near the reactor and are assumed to be exposed to gaseous discharges and direct radiation. The projected doses are 6 to 9.5  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$  and the doses from direct radiation are 0.3 to 0.9  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ . This group's total dose is, therefore, dominated by doses not arising from liquid discharges.

Doses from short duration releases as gases range 0.016 to 0.019  $\mu\text{Sv}/\text{y}$ . These are shown in Table B3. The assessment shows that the dose is 25% from cloud gamma and 75% from cloud beta. 80% of the dose is from xenon-133.

**Table B3 - doses to adults from short duration releases**

Radionuclide	Adult cloud gamma dose ( $\mu\text{Sv}$ )	Adult cloud beta dose ( $\mu\text{Sv}$ )	Total dose ( $\mu\text{Sv}$ )	Percentage
Kr-85	3.57E-06	3.31E-04	3.35E-04	1.80%
Kr-85m	5.08E-04	1.71E-03	2.21E-03	11.88%
Kr-87	2.68E-09	1.02E-08	1.29E-08	0.00%
Kr-88	7.20E-04	2.63E-04	9.83E-04	5.28%
Xe-131m	1.25E-05	2.37E-04	2.50E-04	1.34%
Xe-133	3.32E-03	1.15E-02	1.49E-02	80.11%
Xe-133m	2.43E-07	2.66E-06	2.90E-06	0.02%
Total	4.57E-03	1.41E-02	1.86E-02	100.00%
Percentage	24.57%	75.81%		

# Appendix C - Direct radiation dose to the public from the site

## C.1 Introduction

There are a number of radioactive sources on the site that could give rise to direct radiation off site. Generally, the radiation dose rate on site is likely to be higher close to the sources and, therefore, will expose workers on site. In some situations, a dose rate that may expose members of the public off site can occur. The main sources are from the turbine hall and reactor area and the spent fuel store.

Direct radiation exposure of the public off-site is the regulatory responsibility of the ONR. However, the overall doses to the public from all sources on site, from discharges and direct radiation is our regulatory responsibility. Hitachi-GE provided the results of the direct radiation assessment to ONR. It is also included in the prospective dose assessment Hitachi-GE provided to us. We have, therefore, consulted with ONR on the direct radiation off site and attended relevant meetings. Our main interest is to make sure that the assessment of doses from direct radiation is consistent with the assessment of doses from discharges, so that we can establish a complete picture of the doses to the public.

## C.2. Assessment of direct radiation doses

There are a number of direct radiation sources for the UK ABWR design, some of which may give rise to off site doses. The assessment of direct radiation was divided into 2 groups of sources.

The first group were those sources of direct radiation that already exist in other ABWRs in operation and the dose rates have been measured and are known. The first group is shown in Table C1:

**Table C1. Sources of direct radiation in the first group**

Source	Dose to public ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ )
Reactor building	0.013
Turbine building	0.88
Radwaste building	0.025
Control building	0
Service building	0
Condensate storage tank	0.005
Suppression pool water surge tank	0.017
Total	0.94

The second group are those sources that could be specific to the UK ABWR. These are facilities declared as being still at the concept design stage. The second group is shown in Table C2:

**Table C2. Sources of direct radiation in the second group**

Spent fuel interim storage	Dose to public ( $\mu\text{Sv/y}$ )
Spent fuel interim store	5 <sup>@</sup>
ILW storage facility	0.5 <sup>@</sup>
Wet ILW processing facility	0.5 <sup>@</sup>
Solid ILW processing facility	0.5 <sup>@</sup>
Wet LLW processing facility (treatment facility)	0.5 <sup>@</sup>
Solid LLW processing facility and temporary storage facility	0.5 <sup>@</sup>

<sup>@</sup> These values are dose constraints because these facilities are still at design concept.



## Natural Resources Wales Customer Care Centre 0300 065 3000 (Mon-Fri, 9am-5pm)

Our Customer Care Centre handles everything from straightforward general enquiries to more complex questions about registering for various permits.

### Email

enquiries@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk

### By post

Natural Resources Wales  
c/o Customer Care Centre  
Ty Cambria  
29 Newport Rd  
Cardiff  
CF24 0TP

### **Incident Hotline 0800 80 70 60 (24 hour service)**

You should use the Incident Hotline to report incidents such as pollution. You can see a full list of the incidents we deal with on our 'Report an incident' page.

### **Floodline 0345 988 1188 (24 hour service)**

Contact Floodline for information about flooding.  
Floodline Type Talk: 0345 602 6340 (for hard of hearing customers).

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

**Then call us on**

**03708 506 506** (Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm)

**email**

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

**or visit our website**

**www.gov.uk/environment-agency**

**incident hotline 0800 807060** (24 hours)

**floodline 0345 988 1188** (24 hours)

Find out about call charges ([www.gov.uk/call-charges](http://www.gov.uk/call-charges))



**Environment first:** Are you viewing this on screen? Please consider the environment and only print if absolutely necessary. If you are reading a paper copy, please don't forget to reuse and recycle if possible.