SEA SYSTEMS CONTROLLERATE INTERNAL MINUTE

CONTINUATION SHEET

2. It appears that the raison d'etre for seabed storage is twofold

a. To remove submarines from public view/concern

b. To allow time (60 years!) to decide on a permanent method of disposal for the reactor.

The proposal presumably assumes that the retrieved hulk in its deteriorated state will be docked to have the reactor compartment removed for disposal. The seabed storage option appears to be a short term expedient which could make the final disposal problem more difficult. Has consideration been given to removing the ends of the submarine and storing just the reactor compartment on the seabed? Presumably both deposit and retrieval could be done as a heavy lift, the pressurisation problem would be reduced, the tow could be dispensed with as could the settling/dewatering systems.

3. Unless storage on the seabed is the only way of reducing the radiation risk to the public to an acceptable level, it would seem preferable to keep the hulk afloat so that its condition can be monitored and maintained. (Presumably SSN01 does not present a risk to the public alongside at Rosyth!)

P.M. Bristow

Post script. A copy of the reference has been forwarded to ADNA/MT.