

Intrebări și răspunsuri/ Questions and answers

CJ Timis – Sala Multifunctionala, B-dul Revolutiei 1989, nr.17, Timișoara, jud. Timiș/ County Council Timis – Multipurpose Hall, B-dul Revolutiei 1989, no.17, Timisoara, County Timis

- 29 septembrie 2015 - ora 11.00/ 29 September, hour 11.00

Proiectul „Înființarea noilor blocuri de centrală atomoelectrică la centrala de la Paks – Ungaria”/ The project “Construction of new nuclear power plant blocks Paks NPP II –Hungary

No.	Name/Organisation	Question	Answer
1.	Mr. Liviu Brebe, County Council Timis, institutional chief architect	<p>1.1 Does the cooling water from the NPP units released back to the Danube contain any radioactive material, or how many percentage of the water is radioactive? Does not this water endanger the Danube which actually flows through several other countries?</p> <p>1.2 My other question is that do the four old functioning units satisfy the basic safety standards and measures being applicable for the two new ones?</p> <p><i>*This question as understood according to the Hungarian interpretation based on the sound recording as follows: Are the four old units meet all the safety requirements? Are you planning</i></p>	<p>Representative of the developer:</p> <p>1.1. The answer is short, no, neither radioactive nor chemical material is released to the Danube. We have light water moderated, pressurized water reactors, in which technology the cooling medium containing radioactive material is only present in the so-called primary circuit which is physically separated from the secondary circuit. Therefore even in such cases when there was any damage in the condenser the medium containing radioactive material could not be released into the river Danube, could not pollute the environment.</p> <p>1.2 All the presently operating units of Paks NPP meet all the safety requirements. The Paks NPP conducted an open-minded safety developing activity in the past thirty years and we also have so-called Periodic Safety Analysis Reports in the framework of which the safety of the plant is reviewed in every 10 years. Improving the safety of the presently operating plants was also a common practice before the accident in Fukushima in order to minimize the potential radiological impacts on the environment in the case of beyond design basis accidents as well. After the events in Fukushima, every country conducted so-called stress tests after which further safety improvements were and still being carried out in order to increase the safety of the presently operating plants.</p> <p>My final comment on this question would be that before Hungary became member of the European Union, experts from other European</p>

		<p><i>safety improvement measures in order to achieve the same safety level required for the new ones?</i></p> <p><b>**</b>The same question was understood in Romanian as:  <i>If the four old units respect the standards and measures applicable to the new two units? Also I would like to know if the total of the six units are respecting the standards and the technology presented here as being non-polluting.</i></p>	<p>countries examined the safety of the Paks NPP. They assessed that the safety level of the Hungarian NPP which is actually a 2nd generation power plant is identical to that of those Western-European power plant that has a similar age. This safety level has been and is being increased by the mentioned safety improvements.</p> <p>The answer was considered satisfactory.</p> <p><b>MEWF:</b>  I can say the documentation is available on the MEWF website in order to offer the possibility to consult in detail and if you have additional questions you can transmit them to one of the following e-mail addresses: <a href="mailto:srp@mmediu.ro">srp@mmediu.ro</a> , <a href="mailto:mihaela.macelaru@mmediu.ro">mihaela.macelaru@mmediu.ro</a>, <a href="mailto:cabinet.ministru@mmediu.ro">cabinet.ministru@mmediu.ro</a> and <a href="mailto:office@apmtm.anpm.ro">office@apmtm.anpm.ro</a>. Let me announce that the deadline can be changed from the 15th October, depending on the planned date of the Bucharest public hearing (12-16 October) and to give enough time to the public to express their opinion or to pose their questions.  Thank you.</p>
2.	Mr. Andras Perger, GREENPEACE, Hungary	<p>My name is András Perger and I have a comment on the number of the participants.</p> <p>As I mentioned yesterday we really appreciate that three public hearings were organized in Romania. The only sad thing is that the concerned public participates in these events in a very low number. I would like to call your</p>	<p><b>MEWF:</b> we are doing our best and all the binding legal measures to inform the public on the public hearing in Bucharest. Yesterday I spoke to the Executive Director of the LEPA Timis who has made a press release on the public hearing. Taking into account the low number of participants we are considering the prolongation of the date and deadlines of the questions, comments, opinions being submitted by the public. I also believe that it would have been more efficient if the public had posed their questions directly to the Hungarian experts due to their occupation this time they cannot participate.</p>

		attention to take into consideration the experience of the public hearings of yesterday and today and try to have the concerned public presented in a wider number in the public hearing organized in Bucharest.	
--	--	--	--