

Hunterston A Site:

Appraisal of Options for Long-Term Management of the Solid Waste Disposal Area Non-Technical Summary- September 2008

Assessment of Short-Listed Options against Attributes					
Attribute	Pros/cons & order of preference	Option 1: Stop monitoring	Option 2: Monitor & Maintain	Option 3: Improve containment	Option 4: Remove hazard
Public Safety (conventional safety during intervention works)	Pros	No additional risk.	No additional risk.	Risks associated with intervention largely contained on site.	
	Cons			Negligible risk associated with vehicle movements to/from site. Need to prevent public access during works.	Larger risks due to off-site transport of wastes. Need to prevent public access during works.
	Order of preference	1	1	1	4
Worker Safety (Conventional)	Pros	No additional risk.	No additional risk.		
	Cons			Some risk associated with works.	Larger risks associated with more extensive works.
	Order of preference	1	1	3	4

Additional Waste Volume	Pros	No additional waste.		No additional waste.	
	Cons		Potential for additional waste arisings should further contamination be detected.		Creates 100s-1000s cubic metres of waste for re-disposal.
	Order of preference	1	3	1	4
Transport (excluding safety aspects)	Pros	No additional transport impact.	No additional transport impact.	Negligible additional transport impact (plant going to/from site at start/end of works).	Additional transport mainly associated with off-site waste disposal.
	Cons				
	Rank score	1	1	1	4
Environmental Impact	Pros	No disturbance of fauna and flora.	No disturbance of fauna and flora.	Area landscaped.	Area landscaped.
	Cons	Visual appearance of area remains poor.	Visual appearance of area remains poor.	Short-duration disturbance of fauna and flora (weeks).	Longer-duration disturbance of fauna and flora (months).
	Order of preference	3	3	1	2

Technical Performance	Pros			Hazard isolated from receptors.	Hazard removed.
	Cons	Public and possibly regulator concern of future undetected exposure of contamination.	Potential for further contamination to become exposed and need to be managed.		
	Order of preference	4	3	1	1
Cost	Pros	Cost saving	No up-front cost	Minimal continuing cost (groundwater monitoring)	No continuing cost
	Cons		Ongoing cost of monitoring and management of any surface contamination found (should it occur).	Modest up-front cost (low £100,000s)	Very large up-front cost (£1,000,000s)
	Order of preference	1	2	2	4
Total of order of preference scores		12	14	10	23