

**MINUTES OF THE 10th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT LAKES COLLEGE, LILLYHALL, WORKINGTON
ON THURSDAY 1ST APRIL 2010**

Present:

Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Mr P Daley	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr J Cain	-	Copeland Borough Council
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mrs J O'Reilly	-	Copeland Borough council
Lindsay Gray	-	Churches Forum
Mr P Shawcross	-	Prospect Union
Mr P Mann	-	Sellafield Ltd
Mr D Weatherburn	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr P Fryer	-	Studsvik UK
Mr I Irving	-	Sellafield Limited
Mr W G Poulson	-	Sellafield Limited
Ms S Williams	-	WCSSG Secretariat
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Vice Chairman
Mr R Raaz	-	LLWR
Dr Ian Hudson	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Dr I Tait	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr A Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Prof J Haywood	-	Chairman, Environmental Health sub committee
Mr Ranald Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Cllr N Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr R Hargreaves	-	Community representative
Cllr S Brown	-	Cumbria County Council
Cllr P Tyson	-	Whitehaven Trades Council
Cllr M Davidson	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr Stewart Kemp	-	Cumbria County Council
Cllr T Knowles	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr K Bethwaite	-	Fire & Rescue Service
Mr M Smith	-	Fire & Rescue Service
Mrs R Robinson	-	WCSSG Secretariat

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting, pointed out that there were no planned fire drills and explained that should the alarm sound the roll call area was in the car park.
2. He asked everyone to sign the register at the back of the room that was provided to account for everyone in the event of a role call.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. A number of members were unable to attend the meeting, some of which had sent along representatives, the Chairman welcomed the representatives to the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 01 OCTOBER 09

4. There were no amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 01 October 09.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – ACTIONS OF THE MEETING HELD ON 01 OCTOBER 09

5. The Chairman asked if anyone had any questions with regard to the actions from the last meeting. He mentioned that all the actions had been completed. Martin Forwood is checking to see if he had a response to his questions.
6. **Action: Martin Forwood to confirm the actions relevant to his questions were completed.**

AGENDA ITEM 4 – CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

7. The Chairman informed members that he sits on the group Managing Radioactive Waste Safely Partnership. A link is now available to the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely website via the WCSSG site. Everybody who is registered to the WCSSG website should now receive web alerts. He commented that it is a very useful tool and that a survey had been conducted highlighting that after the UK the second largest user was Japan followed by the USA, then Ireland, there was also usage from the IOM, Sweden, France, Spain and Germany, proving it had been an international success.
8. The Decommissioning sub committee had been postponed due to an administration difficulty; there would therefore be no written report to the committee.
9. The Chairman, Cllr Elaine Woodburn, Cllr Randal Stewart and Cllr Mike Davidson had represented WCSSG and had attended the National Stakeholder Group meeting. The Chairman reported that it was important that WCSSG has good strong representation at the meeting. The key things they were interested in were the NDA strategy and feeding into the NDA strategy and he hoped a lot of the work done there would reflect through in the strategy. The group representing WCSSG supported very strongly all the issues relevant in the areas of waste to support this area.
10. The Chairman explained that there had been a lot of publicity around the issue of the comments made by the CEO of the NDA with regard to Texas City and the comparisons that were made to liken it to Sellafield. The Chair had asked Tony Fountain to come along to the WCSSG meeting to explain what his thoughts and thinking were behind those particular comments. The Chair had received a number of calls from concerned stakeholders about the comments and he felt it

right that the context they were meant in was clarified. Unfortunately Tony Fountain had another engagement and was unable to attend today's meeting however Ian Hudson would cover it in his report.

11. With regard to the public consultation on the NDA Draft Business Plan. The Chairman confirmed there was a big response from West Cumbria. The stakeholder group, local councils and local parish council all picked up on the key issue which was about the socio economic money which was to be reduced from £10 million to £5 million. From the strong lobbying the NDA received from West Cumbria that £5 million proposed in the business plan is now back up to £10 million. The Chairman thought it is very important and key to this area as it is the highest of the four priority areas. He thanked all those who were involved.
12. **AGENDA ITEM 4A – REPORT FROM SELLAFIELD LTD – BILL POULSON**
13. Mr Poulson explained that the Sellafield Ltd report was very detailed and he would endeavour to report on the highlights. One of the key themes the site has underway is trying to continually progress, and progress during the past year has been very good. There are many metrics at the Sellafield site but there are 19 major ones in production areas, clean up areas and accomplishment areas based around weights, measures and types. Of those 19, 14 have exceeded performance and in some cases are the best ever, some of which he would mention throughout his report. He reported that there had been some really superb efforts by employees dealing with and eliminating all kinds of challenges that were not expected, ranging from areas of Thorp, Magnox and High Level Waste among others.
14. Mr Poulson went on to mention WANO. A key element in targets at Sellafield is to have a standard where the world comes to see how it's done. The site is subjected to lots of reviews by World Association of Nuclear Operators (WANO). Mr Poulson explained that he wants to get to a position whereby those reviewers from around the world come to Sellafield to see how the plant operates and they learn lessons to take back as opposed to coming in and learning a few but giving the site a few also. He would like to be in a position where the site is telling them and the site is not being told or in other words 'World Class'
15. Mr Poulson reported that a huge milestone reached in the past year and early part of the current year was the return of the Vitrified High Level Waste to Japan and also to the Netherlands. A lot of effort had been put into the project by people on the site, the various regulatory bodies, the customers involved, the receivers, NDA and INS amongst others. Achieving that return and getting the shipments back to those countries really emphasises that Sellafield is not a place where waste sits. He felt it was a massive achievement for the site as well as for the community, particularly as a lot of the work and activities associated with the project is undertaken with the customer scrutinising your every move so there is added stress and pressure. Both consignments arrived safely on programme, shipping went safely without incident.

16. Mr Poulson reported that another project just finalised was one of the largest asbestos removal projects in the whole of Europe, incorporating dealing with radiological, nuclear and much more industrial type things as well. Over 2,300 tonnes of asbestos was taken out of the Calder Hall stations safely, reducing risk and further contributing to cleaning up the site moving forward.
17. Mr Poulson moved on to talk about the Sellafield MOX plant, reporting that it has been the best year ever with the highest ever throughput of 4.8 tonnes of pellets 1,520 rods last year alone producing 117. A couple of week's prior to the first week it had exceeded 100, this past week was 117. There are eight fuel assemblies awaiting shipment to the European customer which Mr Poulson had reported on at past meetings, the customer is waiting for a convenient point in their schedule to receive them. In terms of the next batch, three have been built; the materials are produced to produce the remaining five that make up the second group of eight which gives a total of 16. Mr Poulson reported that it had been a good effort by the team on MOX who were in the spot light due to the amount of public debate and discussion and press coverage around the MOX plant, but the team stuck to the business in hand and are continually improving the through-put.
18. There was good performance on the Thorp plant with 6,000 tonnes of fuel sheared this year.
19. In terms of Vitrification, Mr Poulson reported that the 4,500 tonnes of equivalent uranium in the glass this year was due to two main things. The melter lines running well, but more importantly more waste per can in terms of waste loading. There has been approximately a 20% improvement of waste loading over the past couple of years which Mr Poulson stated was all due to the operators and the technicians and the engineers that work in the VIT plants working on the recipe, processes and the enhancements to enable more effective waste loading per can.
20. Line 3 is currently in outage, with no further operations until the upgraded safety case is finalised. The site is currently working with the regulator on that undertaking a lot of shield work in the line which has been planned for a number of years. The current campaign was to conclude in March, but the site is still working on the safety case to ensure it is streamlined and robust and it meets the requirements needed to impose on it so that it is the right package for the regulators review and also the right package for the site to operate under.
21. Moving onto Evaporator D which has been mentioned in the press recently, Mr Poulson explained it is the new evaporator project that will significantly buttress the evaporator capacity on the site. Costains is the primary sub contractor, it is currently a year ahead of the scheduled programme of four years. The project is going well and Costains received a project of the year award a few months ago in London. Mr Poulson reported that the project was impressive with a lot of unique construction techniques needed because it is situated in a very congested area of the site. Mr Poulson praised the efforts of the team.
22. Moving on, Mr Poulson reported on Medium Active Solvents and stated that more than 2,300 cubic metres of Medium Active Solvents was successfully waste treated from older stores of reprocessing operations.

23. Referring to B243 Mr Poulson reported there had been a big effort made in that building. A concrete floor was installed, the steel work erected. B243 are old tanks dating from the fifties and not what you would want in today's world so it is a complete upgrade to modern standards.
24. Mr Poulson reported that he felt safety had been 'flat' this year, very good in overall statistics but stagnant in terms of driving even further downward. He continued that safety is a statistic you like to see improvements in every year. It's a good news/bad news story. Talking about the total number of lost time events on site, over half are primarily not work related as such but are such things as walking. Walking to the car, walking from building to building caused by inattention. It is clearly an area which needs improvement.
25. Mr Poulson informed the committee of an event in HALES back in January, there are multiple sources of cooling water to the HALES plant and the HALES tanks. One source was valved-out for a short period of time, there was backup to level six so there were no issues from a safety perspective. Mr Poulson reported that the event was quickly noticed by the operating crew and cooling water was restored within 30 minutes. Sellafield Ltd has an improvement notice on it from the NII, primarily around training and isolators and how Sellafield Ltd conducts main configuration control and maintenance evolutions are to be implemented and or restoration post maintenance is to be accomplished. Mr Poulson pointed out that the key for him is that it is applied site wide. The approach to solving and addressing the upgrades on this that are appropriate in training and in qualification is a site wide thing not HALES specific. He ensured the committee that learning and improvements from HALES would be instilled site wide.
26. Moving on to report on Socio Economics, Mr Poulson commented that it remains an important piece of the process supporting Britain's Energy Coast. Contributions between NDA, Sellafield Ltd and Nuclear Management Partners in both cash and people time are very important. He referred to the recent floods in November where both funds were made available but as importantly and perhaps more so in the near term people were made available. There were many volunteers manning command centres and manning shelters, personnel were deployed to help in the reconstruction aspect to project manage. All the kinds of things that have to be coordinated along with recovery agencies as well as getting it back to normal once the initial impact has decreased, then it's the hard work, there had been a lot of effort by Sellafield Ltd, NDA and NMP to help do that, which illustrates clearly the capacity of people in the area.
27. Mr Poulson referred to NMP's bid which was 16 months ago and there had been a lot of talk about partnership which Mr Poulson reported was important and has to continue. All parties may not always agree on everything but they are talking about it and figuring how to get to an end point and recognising that if they don't work together then there will be a lot of struggle in doing so. In particular with the regulators it has been a good year they have been much attuned toward aggressive, flexible approaches to permitting and permissioning, it doesn't take away the rigour and the robustness but clearly has a good focus on the results we need to achieve rather than just lots of talk about exchanging paper. In particular in high hazard areas like legacy ponds and silos which is a key focus for the site. A new process called flexible permissioning aims to achieve a thoughtful and

rapid approach to getting go ahead's structured to allow high hazard risk reduction to occur on a very smart and good process that's been a good effort between both.

28. Reflecting on that but in a much bigger way Mr Poulson reported on the Evaporator C having to have a licence instrument for it to operate. There is a new one required, the old one had run its course and had to be replaced. That licence instrument had been received on the morning of the WCSSG meeting and it allows Evaporator C to be back up and process up to another 1,000 tonnes of fuel, which allows Thorp to start reprocessing mid April. He felt it was a good example of not just talking about partnership but delivering results from the partnership.
29. In terms of the Life Cycle Base Line, Mr Poulson reported that there were big efforts being made for a May deliverable. He explained that it would have a high focus on high hazard reduction, clearly the site has lots of pieces and parts but high hazard reduction has got to be a centre piece of that for the public, for stakeholders for the NDA's customers. Sellafield Ltd is trying to accelerate that work into the current year from outer years and bring it forward to achieve it more quickly. Sellafield Ltd has targeted about £100 million worth of work to do the earlier quicker work. He explained that the site is in the process of receiving confirmation this year of the overall site funding levels. It was in the press that NDA operating plan allocated £1.5 billion for Sellafield. The site is looking at that to see how it matches up and how the accelerated work fits in and how it all comes together in a proper work package for this coming year. That will be shared with everybody as we work through it.
30. In conclusion Mr Poulson referred to continuous improvement and reported that the statistics this year showed good movement forward, that has to continue and should not plateau. He felt NMP's experience around the world, here, with its AMEC partners, in France with AREVA, back in the US. A lot of things you do on a given year you are amazed two, three and four years later how you keep finding those breakthrough improvements with people on the ground often knowing better than anybody. He thought the statistics this year are absolutely a reflection of now its not always a big complicated programme its just the employees who know the job and come up with ideas to implement and those get you a long way in that improvement process that is clearly the name of the game going forward.
31. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** thanked Mr Poulson for his report and thought it was very comprehensive. He asked if there was much scope for a further increase on the loading on the glass which was currently up to 32%?
32. **A: Bill Poulson:** Explained that when he was running High Level Waste plants in the States the highest they got was the low 40's and it began to get sketchy with the melter. You get to where the viscosity of the glass and the pour rate are competing, but they were able to get up in the low 40 waste loadings for certain combinations of High Level Waste and that varied a lot with the waste characteristics. You have to very carefully work the flow sheet and the chemistry to keep the pour rate right where it doesn't lip under and all those things as you are aware, but no it is not maxed out.

33. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** So there is scope for a bit more?
34. **A: Bill Poulson:** Yes, by all our experience, yes.
35. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** That's good.
36. **Q: Mike Davidson:** referring to his own history when we did a lot of work on the glass / waste mix that was going to be used, in particular, the rate of leeching of waste materials from that glass. I am rather concerned because if you are increasing the waste content of the glass you are becoming increasingly dependant on the metal container the glass is placed in to keep the mix as a mix.
37. **A: Bill Poulson:** The safety case usually takes no credit for the canister. It is not assumed to be there relative to the long term environment impact. I am not aware that is not the same here. We undertake leech rates on the glass canisters and have to pass the same kind of requirements, different from what the US do but it tracks the same. You don't take credit for the canister, which we never did in the states side, I don't think we do here but we can talk.
38. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Socio Economic issues you make a point of saying that for 2010/2011 £2 million of the grant fund is going towards British Energy Coast, West Cumbria. The one's that you identified some of the beneficiaries this year which have been getting funding for a long time, is the £2 million still going to be targeted towards them or is the £2 million going to be within the gift of the Energy Coast board to allocate? You also mention you aim to strengthen your internal systems to ensure commitments made by suppliers align with the plan can I just ask for some further information on how you intend to do that?
39. **A: Bill Poulson:** Referring to the second point, supply side. We have got a significant spend on the supply side more than half a billion a year so there is a tremendous dependency in partnership with those various suppliers of everything from specialised materials to more simple. There have been a lot of challenges this year because the supply side is stretched, the economic conditions likewise puts some of them in a difficult position and a lot of restructuring of contracts is being pursued appropriately, where the risk reward ratio is put into the right position for strong performance on their part and strong delivery to the times we need. There is a lot of effort going into trying to also have suppliers be helped to get better in this business, in this industry. Ways to help them become a supplier that's both competent, capable and up to the standards and up to the pace and speed we have to do things, so there is an out reach effort, there is a helping kind of relationship and there is a tough contract position we want to start taking where it is a paper performance kind of arrangement.
40. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Can I just come back on that and simply because it was raised at the Socio Economic sub committee about the contracts being issued and there is a percentage that is for socio economics which was fine and in fact there was talk about increasing that percentage if it has been done even more welcome. It is making sure that they then deliver on it and the feedback that we got, was the intention Sellafield, British Energy Coast were actually going to do that monitoring to make sure those contracts were actually fulfilled. When we spoke to British Energy Coast they haven't got anybody in place to do that nor did they

foresee anybody doing that in the near future. They are obviously going through some restructure and some changes, so we are losing a period of time where contracts, major contracts are being issued and there is nobody there monitoring the end to see whether they actually comply with the Socio Economic side.

41. **A: Iain Irving:** We did have someone lined up to do that monitoring, that person actually left and they need replaced. It needs to be picked back up again. On your other topics about the socio economic funding through the Energy Coast, first of all yes we will continue to fund the West Cumbria Development Fund for this year, £1.5 million of the funding goes to West Cumbria Development Fund that is used by the agency to support small businesses, if you like with organic growth within West Cumbria so we feel it fits very neatly within the Energy Coast and everything the Energy Coast is trying to deliver. We will continue to support the fund this year, likewise and based in Cumbria, obviously looking to bring business into the area again and fit with the Energy Coast and through the education route, through the local schools. There are continual funding that we will proceed with this year and the balance of the funding that we receive through the NDA will be made available to the Energy Coast Board for initiatives that are coming through as priority there.
42. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Iain, can I just clarify then what you have said, that basically out of the £3.1 million there is really £1.1 million that's going to the Energy Coast Board for their flexibility to use and the other £2 million is going to the areas you have just identified.
43. **A: Iain Irving:** Yes, in broad terms that is correct. There will be some small donations we will hold back obviously, but in broad terms that is correct, yes.
44. **Q: Paul McKenna:** Page eight of Bill's report I have a question in relation to the Legacy Ponds and Silos, you will notice a mention is made of the critical path programmes in relation to the Legacy Ponds and Silos. If you will allow me a short preamble before I ask the question, I notice that this is dealt with a bit differently in the Environment Agency report and the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate report. They seem to mention that more urgency is required with these programmes whereas in your own report the theme seems to be concentrating on laying the foundation slabs for the major plants and of course you have to lay a foundation before you can build a solution that's all fine and good. Certainly reading your report and comparing it side by side with the Environment Agency report and the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate report they seem to be asking for more urgency. With relation to these critical path programmes the question is what is the present day status of these programmes, how many people are presently employed on developing the technical solutions for these programmes or indeed are the solutions still being developed?
45. **A: Bill Poulson:** As you mentioned building the lifecycle base line is to identify everything in the plan that needs to be there, that is under construction and is due for the end of May. In the meantime we are developing opportunities based on approaches taken anywhere around the world to accelerate, speed up and bring previously proven technologies to bear. That is from around the world not just the UK, but US, France and they are not affiliated except in two cases with the parent companies of NMP. We are looking at has previously done this, how they

have done it and from whatever perspective they have got to inform or critique and challenge the performance plans that we are also having to develop. You have a project plan and you have an execution plan, we ask ourselves how are we going to beat it and by how much will we beat it by? We have to deliver both to the NDA and the customer. We are using this process to see if there is anything else that can be implemented into the performance side of that and take advantage of anything somebody has found that was successful, to Oak Ridge at Hanford, at Cap La Hague or where ever so that we integrate that and don't under shoot, or under stretch. That is the work that is currently under way. In terms of the Legacy Ponds and Silos area in totality including engineering, maintenance, construction, operations and project people it is approximately 2,200 people, that includes people at Risley, people on site, people on operating and maintenance of the various facilities that is the construction workers who are all helping deliver and build the various treatment facilities that are being put into the Separation area that take the sludge that comes out of the set machines that are retrieved out of B38 so it's a broad population of people.

46. You also have four major project streams in the past you had talked about the four major projects that are B29, B30, B38 and B41. They had lots of projects that are being built and put in place to support them, for example the retrievals out of B38, that is a whole series of access points to that building. The big separation machines are going to be installed up in the top to then grab and retrieve the waste out of each of the vaults. That has to be put into a plant that can stabilise and package that waste in a proper condition and to be maintained in long term safe storage so you build that plant next door. All of these projects are being constructed, we have the whole thing in line of site accountability and what the criticality path step one, step two, step three to step four. If I am going to be retrieving the waste I have to have the place to put it ready at the same time so that it comes out and goes in rather than retrieve it and don't have that building yet.
47. Laying it all out in an organised plan is what's under way right now. There are 'on the ground' people at this moment besides doing all that are looking and implementing and accomplishing the various risk reductions. I have talked before about sealing off B30 the piping where you had penetrations to that old spent fuel pool, getting those isolated long term which dramatically reduces the risks that if one of those would fail you would have to then have a much more aggressive fix the leak problem.
48. Liquid activity removal in B38 that kicks off end of April early May. There is a major DSO requirement (Department Strategic Objective) at the NDA that's a major activity reduction of the materials in B38 before you get to the major retrievals, so you are getting the activity out. Its putting in place the ionisation and various capabilities to reduce the radiation, and the radio nuclide concentrations that are in those legacy pond areas. Once you start reducing the activity that also then lets you get worker access to more broad work fronts. All that granular risk reduction is going on while the long term projects are under construction and development to support that long term sludge and fuel removal.
49. We are starting to pull all the fuel in, we are de-sludging in effect in B29 right now and we are looking at expedited movement of those fuel elements that are in

B29 and also at B30 and using up HP so it is also taking advantage of and using site facilities that are there that we can put into practice rather than have everything be tied into anything new. Let's use all the systems we have got at our disposal new and all that's already there. I think the last meeting like this we talked about using SIXEP to play role, that's been now integrated into those plans. Some of the planning has also been deconstructing the old plans to get them as aggressive and as efficient as we can, that's when these outsiders come in and we ask them questions its got a brilliant bottom line because you've looked at it so long yourself you don't see anything different.

50. **Q: David Moore:** Did that answer your question?
51. **Q: Paul McKenna:** It was very comprehensive. I think what you are saying Bill is that we are going to see a lot of timelines in this lifetime plan in May and there is going to be agreed timelines with the Environment Agency and the Installations.
52. **A: Bill Poulson:** The performance plan has to have an aggressive attack approach to accelerated clean up as we could accomplish. We use anybody we can find in the world to inform it and contribute to it. We have a carbon fibre arm in D Bay crack for example it has been on site for 30 years. We have a project underway that will clean it, seal it, knock the shine down but its using this real advanced 'space agency'. The carbon fibre arm can have a manipulator its has no weight because you can't have load bearing things on that particular part of the swarf, so its finding where is something available so we don't have to go and design it when it isn't appropriate so it has to be fit for the purpose we need it for and there are enough places around the world that would have had similar kinds of challenges, ie: Hanford, Oakridge the French facilities have all had to deal with similar, not identical issues and to utilise that expertise rather than create it from scratch that can save you a lot of development time that is not needed, it has already been developed, and through department of Energy connections in the US the NDA has access to it if they have spent 100 million dollars developing something for Hanford and its now public let us take advantage of it appropriately, so we are trying to put those into the plans appropriately.
53. **Q: Martin Forwood:** I'd find it really helpful if you could provide some target figures for this coming year, you have often done in the past for all your major commercial operations like, Thorp, Magnox and Vitrification plants, all these documents are littered with comments that targets have been reached and over-reached and under-reached but its not much use if you don't know what the targets are, so I would appreciate it if you could provide target figures.
54. **A: Bill Poulson:** It's a good comment.
55. **Q: Martin Forwood:** I don't mind if that comes in writing afterwards, that's absolutely fine.
56. **A: Bill Poulson:** That's fair, a lot of the comments we are getting is putting the context around data that by itself you don't know where to put it, you know its in isolation you can't tell whether that is good or bad, I agree with you.

57. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Second point, I don't think I've missed it, but you were talking earlier about the funding for Energy Coasts projects, projects in the plural, can you say, do you actually know which individual projects of the Energy Coast that money goes into, do you have a list of them, could you provide a list of them?
58. **A: Iain Irving:** The way it works Martin is we pool our free funding with NDA and with Nuclear Management Partners, that is termed the funding partners, and that fund is then put forward to the Energy Coast. The Energy Coast board of which I personally sit on as does a member of the NDA and NMP and with the rest of the board, go through a prioritisation process for the year in terms of what the key projects are for West Cumbria. What we then do is allocate the Nuclear Partners money to those projects alongside any other funding routes, predominately North West Development Agency. So there is within the Energy Coast Board an investment plan and what that will refer to is the anticipated level of funding coming from either North West Development Agency or the Nuclear Partners, so we do have a listing, but it is done very centrally through the Energy Coast Board.
59. **Q: Martin Forwood:** So are the funding projects you refer to in the document the ones shown as just under half a million for West Coast Energy Projects in the table on the back of the report. Is that the same thing.
60. **A: Shirley Williams:** The funding table is last years spend, this is just to give an idea of how last years money was spent and this was the end of the transition period from the old reactive style of donations to moving to a more strategic focus of money, principally through the energy coast.
61. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Bill, can you just clarify the position of evaporator C, I'm really confused about this, as I understand it, it was closed last summer for this extended outage and re-started in January and now you are saying it is in outage again, but you have just received dispensation from the NII for its start up again.
62. **A: Bill Poulson:** Evaporator C was shut down per agreement with the NII from the licence instrument we had previous, a license instrument is granted for a finite period of time, based on the expectation of wall thickness examinations and other tests, so there is nothing in the Evaporator performance that drives the shut down. Evaporator C was shut down back in the fall per agreement for the purposes of carrying out a full inspection to get a prediction of the remaining life of the material in the evaporator, you then re-submit for the next run back to the NII based on those inspections and those predictions of remnant life of going in and inspecting, we filed that with the NII and the NII by schedule were then supposed to have that turned back to us by the 15th April this year. They go through a long process of accessing the material conditions we gave them and they beat that by giving it back to us just the other day, the other improvement is that the last licensed instrument we had was for supporting a 300 tonne campaign processing, that has now been increased to 1000 so we've got the licensed instrument in hand to restart evaporator C, it can now run for a longer campaign before it has to come back down for the same process again at some later period.

63. **Q: Martin Forwood:** are we talking about 1000 tonnes for Thorp alone or is that for Magnox and Vitrification as well?
64. **A: Bill Poulson:** Yes its Uranium equivalent, so you can as you know mix and match as to where you can dedicate to Magnox, Thorp or a combination depending on what the two streams are processing there is an advantage to which evaporator, but its 1000 tonnes Uranium equivalent. What that also says is that when we went in and did the inspection there was very good results that the remnant life was the wall thickness was extraordinary robust it's a newer better machine and it showed so when they did the inspections which gave the NII and ourselves confidence that the longer periods were perfectly adequate and appropriate.
65. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Bottom of page 8 of the report, the last line I'm mystified, you say 'drive to re-deploy personnel in order to deliver six4five, now that to me sounds like either a TV game show or a new type of breakfast cereal, I'm sure it isn't but what is six4five?
66. **A: Bill Poulson:** Six4five, in effect it takes the next 6 years worth of Sellafield work by plan and deliver it in the next 5 years, so taking a year out of a six year run.
67. **Q: Martin Forwood:** On page 10 second from bottom paragraph, you talk about the hill removal project, that sounds pretty drastic which hill is it on the site and I understand it is to make room for a comprehensive, import / export facility, what exactly is that going to import and export, so which hill is it and what is it going to do when its built?
68. **A: Bill Poulson:** It is reducing where there has been an industrial spoils pile.
69. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Are we talking then down towards the golf course end?
70. **A: Bill Poulson:** Yes, that's where the encapsulation plants are, so it's to get that levelled off and export / import means ability to get waste into the site, export and import on site getting waste from the other facilities, so it is extra on site storage capacity.
71. **Q: Martin Forwood:** What kind of waste imports from other sites?
72. **A: Bill Poulson:** No on site not off site.
73. The Chairman noted that the Sellafield Ltd report was not issued on time to go in the pack.
74. **ITEM 5 – LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY REPORT**
75. The Chairman invited Dick Raaz to represent the LLW report.
76. Mr Raaz reported that vault 9 continues to move ahead, it suffered from the heavy rains in November and the very cold several weeks in December and January but the vault is nearing completion. The most important feature about vault 9 is that large portions of its pad have been turned over to operations for use

in managing waste as of last July, when LLWR got the first large areas of the pad transferred to operations, and since there have been two further large portions of the pad transferred to operations so in effect the mission contribution of vault 9 was completed last Summer and LLWR will finish the construction of the walls and the rest of the pad very soon. By the next meeting LLWR will have had some kind of an opening ceremony for it but it has been in use since last July. That allows LLWR to very carefully use the remaining disposal capacity in vault 8 LLWR has been moving light containers out of vault 8, storing them on vault 9 pad and preserving the vault 8 disposal capacity for items it truly wants off the books and grouted and in place. B38 waste from Sellafield is a perfect example of that LLWR doesn't want to store it in vault 9 but in vault 8, so is managing that quite carefully.

77. Mr Raaz reported that Segregated Waste Services the whole point of the new national strategy which is to manage waste in an environmentally sustainable way has been formally sanctioned by the NDA and incorporated into the new consigner contracts.
78. The Safety case continues to make good advance. Mr Raaz stressed it is very important that the environmental safety case which includes the post operational safety case for the site meet the environment Agency's needs. It must be submitted by May 2011 and LLWR is about to lock down the data set that will be used to finalise the analysis and build the safety case so that the requirement can be met.
79. LLWR meet frequently with the Environment Agency to ensure that what goes to them won't be a surprise to the Environment Agency, which in turn will lead to a less drawn out authorisation period. The 2002 safety case took 4 years to finalise and certainly didn't come out in any satisfactory long term way, LLWR is hoping this one when it goes in next May a year from now won't go through quite such a drawn out review process and that LLWR receives it in about 2 years but nobody can guarantee that, certainly no regulatory agency will commit in advance as to what they will find when they finally get into the safety case, but LLWR's objective is to ensure EA know quite a bit about the content when submitted in 2011.
80. Mr Raaz reported that since the report was written and distributed DECC has determined that the very low level waste applications from various entities across the UK including Cumbria will be required to submit an article38 filing which in general says that the UK must advise the member states in the EU of the impact of the change of purpose for those facilities. Mr Raaz believed that would slow down those applications by at least 9 months possibly a year which is distressing in a certain sense because it means that there won't be any VLLW alternate disposal schemes in the Country for at least that long and LLWR's objective is to get as many of the waste hierarchy alternatives on line as soon as possible.
81. Mr Raaz reported that LLWR had received the sanctioning for the new consigner contracts they are out being signed by the thirty plus waste generators who send LLWR waste. The big consigners specifically Sellafield and Magnox have signed them and LLWR has its first shipment under those new contracts today (1st April) from Sellafield. The big changes to the contracts are, it is consistent

financially for all waste generators, everybody pays the same rate whether they are Government or private, commercial, hospitals, MOD, they all pay the same rate and it provides access to the entire spectrum of waste treatment services that LLWR believe are so important to managing the waste in accordance with that policy that was issued in 2007. The whole objective is to get the waste hierarchy up and running in the UK in accordance with that policy. Mr Raaz continued that just a few years ago if you had Low Level Waste your only choice was to send it to LLWR for grouting and disposal or somehow establish that it was exempt waste and didn't need to go to LLWR but that was it, there were no other options, LLWR is now trying to get metal treatment, combustible treatment and alternate disposal all in place in time to meet the huge demands expected coming out of a full board decommissioning that lies before them.

82. LLWR received two days ago (30th March) from the County the revised PCM planning permission which Mr Raaz reported was very good news. It means LLWR can delay the final demolition of the PCM magazines and the treatment packaging facilities that were built onto them and time the demolition as LLWR build vaults going south from 9. Mr Raaz emphasised the waste treatment options being brought to the consigners none of that will be done at LLWR, none of that will be handling the waste on site the whole intent is to use commercial or existing facilities for incineration, metal treatment etc. The idea is to reduce the amount of waste that needs to go to disposal LLWR wants to preserve the very valuable vault space to materials that need that robust protection for disposal. it is going almost exactly as LLWR envisioned in the build up of the bid that was submitted in February 2007, that bid was turned into a life time plan that was accepted by the NDA in the fall of 2008 about five months after LLWR took over the site, LLWR is exactly on that plan, and the schedule achievement is very close to 1.0 and cost performance is slightly above 1 which means LLWR has spent about 4% less of the cost than expected to get to this point, which is a good news story, next year LLWR will be executing year three of that contract.
83. Mr Raaz concluded by reporting that LLWR has been hosting dozens of international, national and local organisations and groups to the site, the most common reaction it gets is how big it is, how much work is going on that no-one knows about because they can't see it due to the surrounding trees around the site.
84. **Q: Ranald Stewart:** In the last annual report and accounts of the NDA, one of the statistics shown is LLWR having the highest number of sickness days average per employee across the whole NDA estate, that is a year out of date, is it improving?
85. **A: Dick Raaz:** It is improving and unfortunately for the wrong reason, I'm not trying to be flippant here, we have a very small workforce about 120 and two of our employees were on long term disability and unfortunately died, so when you are loosing 1500 hours per year because of their long term disability it really makes you stand out statistically, so unfortunately it is going to get a whole lot better because they are not counting against us any more, our safety performance is not as good as we would like, we have had no injuries since we last met that needs to be the case every time, we did have two recordable lost time accidents last year, one in PCM and one where a supervisor in vault 9 was cleaning up his

shed and slipped on a piece of plastic and wrenched his back, so he was out for 3 days. The safety performance is not as good as we wanted and its not bad and the sickness numbers are quite large, because of those two cases we inherited when we came on site.

86. **Q: Ranald Stewart:** Thank you, I'm sorry to hear about those two cases I think it might be helpful if some reason was put into the report.
87. **A: Dick Raaz:** I don't like making excuses for safety performance we take safety seriously, we have agreed to use those measurement systems to judge our safety performance and I do not want to discount or excuse my way out of them, its very frustrating when someone slips in the parking lot, they've just parked their car, they're walking into their office, they slip and they turn an ankle your tempted to say that's not my fault I don't have to do anything about it and that's the wrong answer, you do, for example, we have had quite a campaign for proper footwear for our employees and it's a key component to slips, trips and falls, do you have the right footwear on. That is the kind of focus you have just got to have, you cannot accept excuses, and you cannot accept did we do enough to get those workers identified early enough in their illness to get them the care they needed. I don't want my staff to think, they have nothing to do with it and there's nothing to be done. I'm not satisfied with that performance at all.
88. **Q: Sue Brown:** This was the first I knew about DECC's recommendations about the alternative disposals, had you planned a certain amount of capacity to leave the site and be moved elsewhere and if so if there is a delay of 9 months or even more, what effect does that have on the activities on the site?
89. **A: Dick Raaz:** Fortunately for us all, the amount of waste that is being generated from actual tearing down facilities which is where the bulk of this material is going to come from, those tasks are not going on very much, so the impact is likely to be nil. Sooner or later, this is going to have to be solved, we knew that we had some time to solve it and the whole push was to get everything in place as fast as we could and do it safely and properly. I'm distressed at this delay, but I'm not tearing my hair out either. Where the VLLW facilities will be is a far from settled debate, certainly there is a lot of concern about VLLW facilities in Cumbria there is equally intense debates going on across the rest of the country those will have to run their course, I will observe that the technical driver to get VLLW facilities is so strong that there will have to be a way to do it, I don't want to assume the political answer but technically it has to be done, whether it ends up on existing licensed sites be it Sellafield, LLW site or any of the other sites remains to be answered but we just cannot afford to waste the vaults to abuse them on the low end we have just got to find an answer and it takes time, the process is the process and I can't impose the process but I can keep everybody's attention focused on what's needed.
90. **Q: Martin Forwood:** I wonder whether you could just remind me please, when vault 8 is eventually full what are your plans for storing the waste that is still being imported while you are waiting for vault 9 to open?
91. **A: Dick Raaz:** The intention is to use vault 9 for storage until the safety case is completed and the Environment Agency has granted us a new authorisation to

continue disposing beyond vault 8. So we are going to preserve that remaining component in vault 8 as long as possible and store waste on the vault 9 pad until we get that new authorisation. If we don't get it then another disposal route will have to be identified and established but our plan is to just simply hold the waste, get the new authorisation in place, then dispose of the materials that we have collected in vault 9. I can't predict how all of that will go because I would have to assume a regulatory conclusion that is not my place to do.

92. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Have you got a best estimate as to when vault 8 will be finally full?
93. **A: Dick Raaz:** It may still have some space by 2012 – 2013, I hope it does, my intention is to put everything into vault 9 storage that I can from hence forward and when we have the new authorisation then we will go ahead and finish filling vault 9 and a key step in this whole sequence here is to get going on the cap, the permanent cap on the trenches and the cap on vault 8 and we want to start that work and bring it South as we fill up the new vaults, but I can't do any of that until I have that new authorisation that gives me the final answer on what's going to happen to all that waste, we want to dispose it, but we just have to complete the process, so I think we may if we manage this correctly still have some space left in vault 8 in a year from now maybe two.
94. **AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY**
95. Dr Hudson wished to put some context around some of the comments that were captured from Tony Fountain in the newspaper article. He continued that since Mr Fountain started in October last year he has been a frequent visit to Sellafield he has been around the legacy ponds and silos areas, he has been around the reprocessing facilities and he has engaged quite closely with a number of key people around the site and some of the communities as well. One of the things that comes across is a very strong commitment in terms of the priority of Sellafield within the NDA estate, Dr Hudson felt that was important to understand.
96. In terms of the article, Mr Hudson commented that what was perhaps misunderstood from the way that the article was written was when Mr Fountain visited the legacy ponds and silos he absolutely saw that as one of the key priorities from an NDA perspective to ensure it musters all the resources and capacity into the issues around the legacy ponds and silos. He thought what Mr Fountain was referring to was a strong passion for the priority around the legacy ponds and silos and actually trying to drive the improved or accelerated clean up of those areas. Dr Hudson thought that was probably not captured particularly well through the article.
97. In terms of the issues around the comments about Texas City, Dr Hudson explained that Mr Fountain was not likening it to Texas City he was referring to the history of how NDA ended up with the legacy ponds and silos as they are today in the go forward position and it is important that what we are reflecting on was where were the priorities in terms of making sure that we did maintain and clean up the legacy ponds and silos in the late eighties and nineties. If you look

at the go forward position in terms of the work that has been done this last year in going forwards there has been quite a lot of progress against reducing some of the legacy and some of the risks associated with the legacy plants and there is actually a really good accelerated programme that has been emerging from NMP and the way things are going forward. Dr Hudson felt that what didn't come out in the article was the history that Mr Fountain was referring to rather than actually the go forward position.

98. He thought it was worth reminding members that NDA has to keep a real focus in terms of the legacy plants and ensure it does deliver on that clean up mission, he thought Mr Fountain was reminding members and others that that is one of the focuses for NDA.
99. Dr Hudson continued that it was unfortunate that Mr Fountain was not present at the meeting but he had spent a lot of time talking to him about the priorities of Sellafield and Dr Hudson reported that Mr Fountain is absolutely passionate about the priority of Sellafield and clean up of the legacy plant and felt that sometimes those things don't quite get captured in newspaper articles.
100. In terms of the NDA update and the report, NDA has finished the fiscal year and reflecting on the performance to date, Dr Hudson reported that the NDA uses DSO targets (Departmental Strategic Targets) to focus the efforts of the site and overall performance for Sellafield. 41 out of 44 DSO targets have been achieved with roughly a third of those targets focused on legacy plants and decommissioning activities, roughly a third of the activities of those targets have been focused on the enabling activities to improve the performance at Sellafield, an example would be instruction of the conduct of operations approach that NMP has brought and roughly one third are around the operating plants such as some of the reprocessing plants and some of the waste treatment plants. Dr Hudson confirmed that performance has been good as we would observe it from Sellafield, NDA also observes a good strong leadership culture around safety and Mr Poulson had talked around the fact that some of the figures are static, what NDA has seen is improved periods of good safety performance around some of the major projects that extended performance around the operations at site and also observed what seems to be a good relationship working with the regulators recognising the different roles that actually leading to improvements in terms of operations at site.
101. The outturn for the year is £1.45 billion approximately, putting that in context Dr Hudson reported that the spending review number from this period spending review would have been £1.25 billion so NDA has been allowed and able to with Government draw down some of the additional commercial income that has been generated across the estate and reapply some £200 million on top of the original spending review. A lot of that funding is focused on the decommissioning and legacy plant areas because that is the priority. Dr Hudson felt this was good news in terms of seeing decent value in terms of performance but also good news in terms of where the focus and priorities are for NDA.
102. In terms of the going forward position and the NDA business plan the position in the business plan is £1.5 billion which is an upturn in terms of the funding from last year. The focus is around the legacy plants and the decommissioning

programmes that is really important to the NDA. As part of the number NDA is also looking for improvements in efficiency and improvements of performance also, so those are the sorts of things NDA is looking to see included in the numbers going forward. Dr Hudson felt that given the state of public finances, the ability to maintain and improve the funding levels at Sellafield is a success.

103. Dr Hudson referred to the socio economic uplift from 5 to 10 and the reflection that the lobbying from the West Cumbria community changed that. Dr Hudson was quite pleased about that as it actually demonstrates and reflects the fact that NDA listens and modifies some things.
104. Dr Hudson continued that one of the big activities for NDA going forwards is the development of the life cycle baseline and he went on to explain a little about the components of the plan. In the plan there is a reflection of the activities that absolutely need to be carried out on site and the priorities that NDA expects to see. A second component to the plan which is still being developed is the performance plan, so that is the thing that reflects all the new initiatives that NMP has committed to bring in terms of competition and also reflects the improvements that you would expect to see in operations around site. Those things are coming together on time in terms of schedule and Dr Hudson expected to have a decent picture of those elements of the plan June/July time. Dr Hudson thought it was really important that the plan is put together and important that NDA get that focus in terms of accelerating some of the activities around the legacy plant.
105. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Just on the first page, NDA 'the plans were never approved', I think that action came from an issue I raised regarding the deferral of work and obviously to secure funding for the future because obviously the clue is in the name, Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and obviously we need to decommission and accelerate that clean up and I was just concerned that we were seeing work deferred and deferred and deferred. I don't understand what you mean by the plans were never approved, 07 and 09, 08 wasn't approved, but 07 and 09 were approved.
106. **A: Ian Hudson:** I think 07 and 08 is factually correct weren't approved or accepted by NDA, I think that is correct. In terms of the questions about deferrals, one of the things that was occurring from 07 to 08 in terms of the plans was that the plans that were being submitted were really focused very much on total numbers and assumed improvements and one of the problems was that you can't actually get the capacity or you can't apply the capacity to deliver the actual work scope, so there is only a certain amount that the site can deliver, so what we tried to do with the new plans is actually apply the practical capacity to deliver, because you can't just pour money into a place and expect it to deliver all the work scope, so I think the issue around deferrals is rather than talking the detail of LTP 07 and 08 what we'd like to do is try and understand what it means in the capacity to deliver in the future plan, so its not a question of the additional money, its actually deliverability that's the key thing that's driving it and effectively what you have to do is apply that capacity to the higher priority projects on site which will be the legacy plants, so we have to wait and see what the plans look like in June/July in terms of where the priorities and what the capacity is to deliver.

107. One of the things you would expect to see and we are seeing this last year is NMP is improving the capacity for the site to deliver so you are able to carry out more work for the same amount of money, and that is something that we welcome and we'd like to see going forwards.
108. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** When I look back at the minutes of where that action came from, I don't believe they captured the essence of what I was trying to put across in the sense that we have to keep demonstrating continuous improvement and I'm really passionate about advertising that obviously for the members I represent. I was just unclear as we seem to paint a different picture when we are measuring against different things all the time, I think you are right to look forward. You have answered my question thank-you.
109. **Q: Tim Knowles:** The question relates to the National Nuclear Laboratories, central laboratory face to Plutonium commissioning. That facility, Sellafield Technology Centre as it used to be called has been built now for 10 years, the NNL has been in operation for some little time now, there is no doubt that phase two plutonium lab is a world leading facility in everybody's opinion it is a superb facility, there appears to be even within the existing life time plan over 50 million pounds worth of potential business which can be done there, there are huge opportunities in terms of mitigating risks in relation to that plan and yet as far as I can see very little progress has been made to commission that facility. It would be interesting to have an NDA perspective, but as I understand it the NNL reports direct into DECC's shareholder executive and even though we have this hugely important facility located at Sellafield, we've also a facility at Workington, we don't have a way in through this committee to comment on important aspects like that and I would just like Ian's take on it because I think it is something we ought to address head on.
110. **A: Ian Hudson:** A couple of things, you are right to reflect that the national nuclear lab reports directly into DECC so the way that the National Nuclear Lab works is similar to some of the NDA sites, the Government arranged their competition for the management and operations of NNL, the company that won that were a consortium of bidders made up of Battelle who run national labs in the US, Serco who do equivalent things in the UK and Manchester University, the contract is a three year plus two year optional extension as well. NDA's role in relation to the national lab is interesting, the first role or the sites within the NDA and also the NDA itself is a customer of the national lab, so we both fund work directly with the national lab and also through the sites. I cannot remember the exact numbers that go into national lab from Sellafield but I would guess its in the order 30 – 40 million pounds a year that sort of order of magnitude but we can confirm those figures if necessary. The second element of the relationship is the fact that NNL actually operates a number of facilities that belong to NDA and they operate them under a license that is overseen from a safety perspective so they operate B13 elements, or the central lab at Sellafield and other places such as Springfields, so there is a formal relationship there as well in terms of the facilities and those facilities are not only key facilities for NDA work they are key for the UK also. It would seem logical that NNL would be represented or would participate in some of these things because they are independent of the NDA and its worth getting those things on the book or here to have comments

around those issues. I think the existence of NNL in West Cumbria, the central part of NNL is absolutely critical in terms of positioning West Cumbria skills and capability in nuclear not just decommissioning but the broader nuclear agenda for the UK. So I think the fact that it has been set up as NNL is actually very positive for Cumbria, there are things we need to work well with NNL is how you exploit that from a West Cumbrian perspective both nationally and internationally.

111. In terms of the phase two facilities, I think there is work underway looking at a business case around what the value is of the commissioning of phase two, I'm not sure exactly of the timescale of that business case but NNL is looking to try and make that case back into Government so they can get the funding to actually finish the commissioning of phase two.

112. **Tim Knowles:** Thank you for that Ian it was very helpful, it strikes me that here is an absolutely superb facility that as far as I can see doesn't have parallel the potential for assisting in the decommissioning of Sellafield, forgetting about other issues related to Plutonium that might come in the future or not, the existing situation frankly could be greatly helped by the utilisation of that facility and seems to be that there is a great deal of timidity in addressing this. Its been ten years now, some years since the NNL was set up and yet nobody has had the courage to take this decision and I think it is something that this committee ought to take seriously and Chairman, I think the NNL is so important to us in terms of the nuclear sites that we ought to consider this committee's engagement with them.

113. **Chairman:** Thanks for that, in light of what you've said I'll have the secretariat have another look at the membership that we have for the committee and see if that's appropriate and to invite other members if we feel they would have something to offer, so I'm quite happy to talk to them and see if they would like to come along to the committee.

114. Action – secretariat to approach NNL and ask if they would like to become members of the WCSSG

115. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Just two points, could you say what the NDA's intentions are in terms of taking another hard look at Sellafield MOX plant. At the last commercial operations meeting I think we were told that on completion of the current campaign a review would certainly be undertaken by the NDA whether or not a decision was made I don't know, is that still the intention once this contract is completed to review the plant's future again?

116. **A: Ian Hudson:** NDA reviewed the Sellafield MOX plant towards the end of last year and the basis of that decision was a number of things, the first was are there customers for the products of MOX plant, secondly is the MOX plant going to be able to achieve and deliver the kind of products and the volume of products in terms of the improvements to meet those customer demands and can you actually implement the operational improvements on the plant to achieve some of those things so there are a number of elements to that.

117. The other part of it was building confidence in terms of can we see a prolonged period of operations at the MOX plant and start and build confidence that the longer term performance of the plant can be improved. If you think about those elements, it is an interesting experience seeing that SMP has delivered the targets and actually bettered the targets this year in terms of rods and fuel assemblies and is actually in the process of meeting the contractual requirements. The second question is 'are there customers out there prepared to pay for the products of SMP'? I think there is still some work to be done around that, but the view late last year was that there does look to be some level of confidence in customers prepared to look at the products for SMP so there is that element there and the engineering programme, there is an engineering programme to improve the performance and it looks like that shows a lot of opportunities for improvements, so NDA's conclusion last year was if you put those things together there is a case for SMP to continue operating. I'm not sure there was any particular break points that were highlighted at the time in relation to SMP so I'm not quite sure what you are referring to but at the moment the intention is for SMP to continue operating.
118. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Well it was simply a point made by the NDA to the commercial operations stakeholder group that come the end of the current contract they would take a fresh look at the plants future.
119. **A: Ian Hudson:** That current contract hasn't finished yet there is still a number of assemblies to be delivered.
120. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Do you also take into account presumably whether the plant is value for money that's after all what the NDA is supposed to be seeking?
121. **A: Ian Hudson:** That would be an element of the decision absolutely.
122. **Q: Martin Forwood:** You talked about LTP 10 and some parts of it. Can you say when the whole LTP 10 will be available in the public domain it has taken ages?
123. **A: Ian Hudson:** In terms of timescales, the contractual commitment from NMP in terms of delivering the base line plan was 18 months so for the end of May and that is the delivery to the NDA. Just to give you a sense of the context and some personal experience of these things, to re-build a plan of this complexity and magnitude I've seen places in DoE and in France take up to two years to do that so 18 months is actually quite ambitious. NDA receive it at the end of May and we have a period of a couple of months to see whether we can review it and approve it, so we need to formally accept that, there is a plan to start releasing the information in terms of the plan to start giving a sense of what the objectives and outcomes are and you will certainly see a lot more of that in the next financial year.
124. There is another piece of work that is key as part of the life time plan that is the numbers of people, the socio economic impact so our things that were agreed through the energy coast board was to appoint someone to do an additional review of the numbers and jobs built into that plan and what it does in relation to some of the initiatives on the energy coast. A lot of the information is going to

come out early next financial year and I think we are also starting to gear up to do that additional socio economic study as well which is quite important.

125. **Chairman:** The Chairman reminded the NDA as the latest to send in it's report that the committee has a constitutional commitment to have reports available to members 10 working days in advance of the meetings.

126. **AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM STUDSVIK**

127. Paul Fryer introduced himself as the Engineering Manager for the Studsvik Metals Recycling Facility at Lillyhall. He proposed to pick out highlights from his report which he emphasised was submitted on time to the committee and then field any questions that might arise from it.

128. Since receiving its first consignment of metallic waste in September, Studsvik has had numerous consignments delivered to the Lillyhall site. Laterally it has taken in and processed some larger items which hadn't been containerised in the shapes of tanks and some other items. Those items were successfully size reduced and decontaminated and the figures presented show a total reduction in volume of 97%.

129. Mr Fryer reported that some waste had been received during the period which could not be decontaminated fully and that was despatched to the Swedish plant for further processing through the smelting process.

130. He continued that the MRF is designed to take primarily containerised waste but has been receiving some larger items still within its waste acceptance criteria. Studsvik is currently looking at possibilities of some investment to increase its capability to treat the larger items of waste.

131. Since the report was produced Studsvik has had one additional minor first aid incident or accident where one of the operators hit himself on the hand with a hammer when he was size reducing. Mr Fryer reported that Studsvik has a commitment to use or to develop the use of mechanical handling equipment which will reduce or eliminate this type of accident.

132. Another highlight since the report was submitted was the recruitment of one operator and the advertisement for the role of assurance Manager, (Health and safety Manager). The advert had been in the local press the previous weekend.

133. Summing up, Mr Fryer concluded the operations continue with the MRF, it continues to size reduce and decontaminate, it is looking at investment in some future different equipment to handle bigger and heavier components, it is still in the commissioning phase, with that expected to be completed in October and it is in the process of recruiting additional people to the MRF.

134. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** Paul could you explain fully why you couldn't decontaminate that one piece of equipment, it gives the wrong vibes out I feel that perhaps it might have been more active than it should have been?

135. **A: Paul Fryer:** The facility has been designed to decontaminate surface contamination or take off surface contamination. This particular material was

activated, although it was still within the levels of the waste except criteria the process that we employ just takes off a slight surface film up to a couple of microns and because the material was activated that process couldn't remove the contamination.

136.**Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Are they then going to melt it at Studsvik.

137.**A: Paul Fryer:** Yes it meets the criteria for the Studsvik plant in Sweden and during that process of smelting the radionuclides appear in the slag and then the slag is separated off and disposed of and the material then is exempted.

138.**Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Are there any plans to build a similar smelter in this country?

139.**A: Paul Fryer:** I think there are plans to do that but it would have to go through the necessary planning authorisations.

140.**ITEM 8 – NII REPORT**

141.The Chairman explained that there was not a report received but he reported that the committee is in discussions about how NII is going to try and align the reports more to what the stakeholder needs are. He thanked Dr Tait for the work he had undertaken on that and asked him to give his verbal report.

142.Dr Tait apologised to the committee for not distributing the report covering the last reporting period before the meeting. He explained that it was a long standing problem and he was attempting to try and speed up the process and try and bring the NII's reporting periods in line with the meetings.

143.He also wished to mention the format and content of the NII reports which were gradually changing. This is being done to try and make the reports easier for the public to read. He commented that the reports should not be designed to be read by scientists and engineers. NII is aiming to remove all jargon and superfluous material such as information repeated from previous reports and to concentrate on what NII has been doing and hopefully give confidence that it is doing it's job properly.

144.Dr Tait also reported that he is working with Sellafield Ltd to produce a list of facility descriptions that are acceptable to OCNS and to place these on the website, again to make the reports easier to read for members of the public.

145.Dr Tait's verbal report covered key matters that had arisen since the previous report covering the period October to December 2009.

146.Dr Tait began by reporting on the Legal Reform Order. As part of the restructuring of the Nuclear Directorate to establish it as a Nuclear Statutory Corporation, a Legal Reform Order (LRO) needs to be laid before Parliament. The aim was to lay this LRO in early 2010 with the new body to be established in April 2011. Unfortunately, given the proximity to the General Election, Ministers decided not to lay the LRO in this Parliamentary session. The LRO has been published recently on the Department of Energy and Climate Change

website, and a revised time table for the introduction of the new body is being developed.

147. On the theme of openness and transparency, Dr Tait reported that, as part of the transition to a Nuclear Statutory Corporation, an openness and transparency project had been set up. The project is to facilitate the ND Management Board's wishes to be more open and transparent about NII's regulatory decision making processes. NII has produced Project Assessment Reports or (PAR's) to support the regulatory decisions covering the granting of any licence instrument and as a pilot NII is going to produce executive summaries of the PAR's and place them on the NII website sometime in April.
148. Moving onto Sellafield site wide matters, Dr Tait continued that there were four matters that he wished to bring to the committee's attention, the first being the life time plan 10. NII is satisfied with the life time plan process but both NII and EA are concerned about the deferral dates for some facilities. LTP 10 will provide a contract baseline between SL and the NDA however it will not be a plan that NII or EA can accept. The Integrated Change Programme (ICP) will therefore be vital in bringing these dates forward.
149. NII continues to monitor the ICP through the monthly ICP forum and at the February forum both the NII and EA expressed concern about the lack of visibility of delivery, which did not provide them with the confidence they required.
150. Dr Tait reported that at the ICP forum this week Sellafield Ltd provided a lot of very useful information on the work being undertaken on the high hazard areas, but Dr Tait stated that NII and EA still needed further evidence to give them confidence that the ICP will deliver the accelerated hazard reductions required. Sellafield Ltd had agreed to provide further evidence at the next forum.
151. In support of NII's work on projects associated with the ICP, one NII inspector and one member of the NDA accompanied Sellafield Ltd staff on a visit to Savannah River in the USA. The NII inspector found the visit most useful as he saw first hand the results of 'role back' disciplined operations' and 'projectisation' which are initiatives SL wishes to introduce at Sellafield.
152. Moving onto Radioactive Substances Act Authorisation, Dr Tait explained that NII inspectors took part in a consultation exercise undertaken by EA, on the variation to the Sellafield and Windscale RSA authorisation and a formal response had been provided to EA.
153. Dr Tait reported that NII is very supportive of the recent SL initiative to introduce baseline surveys of the site. These surveys will identify and catalogue leakages of radioactive material outside buildings on the site. Dr Tait stated that most leakages are likely to be historic and will have already been recorded and managed, however SL is regularly updating NII and EA as the survey work progresses.

154. NII has been working with EA, SL and the NDA on the production of a high hazard reduction plan and he commented that Mr Mayall would be giving an overview on that subject further into the meeting.
155. With regards to non routine matters, Dr Tait reported that there is one non-routine matter he wished to raise which was the temporary disruption of the cooling water supply to the highly active liquor (HAL) storage tanks in January. He reported that the tanks experienced a loss of cooling water incident on the 22nd January. An incident similarly involving a loss of cooling water occurred on the 1st April 2009 which had been covered in a previous NII report.
156. NII has continued to investigate the more recent event in line with HSE guidance and formal statements were taken the week prior to the WCSSG meeting. NII intends to use the current investigation to ensure that SL implements the learning from both these events.
157. Dr Tait continued that a number of issues have emerged from the investigation to date and one particular concern is the training of Nominated Persons Process Plant and Equipment Isolations. These are staff authorised to isolate plant and equipment. Shortcomings in the training of these Nominated Persons were such that NII was of the opinion that SL was in contravention of Licence Condition 10, and that it had failed to make adequate arrangements in the HAL plants for the suitable training of the Nominated Persons who have responsibilities for operations which may effect safety.
158. In order to formalise a process of compliance with SL's statutory duties, an Improvement Notice was issued on the 4th March 2010, requiring SL to remedy these contraventions by the 18th June.
159. Dr Tait moved on to report on routine matters. Firstly, Magnox reprocessing operations and contingencies for Magnox fuel. He stated that NII and EA are keen to see SL develop a viable contingency for Magnox fuel, should the Magnox Operating Programme fail to reprocess all the spent fuel from the remaining Magnox stations. Work in this area continued during the quarter.
160. Secondly, the Highly Active Liquor (HAL) waste plants and Waste Vitrification Plant Line 3, Dr Tait commented that last year NII permissioned the operation of WVP line 3 under enhanced administrative controls, pending the completion of engineering improvements. This permission was time based and it expired on 30th March. NII has recently assessed the safety case, submitted by SL to continue operation of Line 3 and found it to be inadequate. Line 3 operations will therefore not now recommence until NII has received and accepted an adequate safety case.
161. Moving onto the HAL Stocks Specification. NII is still working with SL on revisions to the HAL Stocks Specification No 679. The revisions are required to ensure that the Specification is appropriate for the storage of the less active liquors, that are likely to arise during the post operation clean out of the plant.
162. Moving onto MOX operations, and a visit to MELOX in France. MELOX is a MOX fabrication plant in France and Dr Tait reported that three NII inspectors

together with SL staff visited that plant. The purpose of the visit was to understand the processes used in France for rod fabrication as SL is looking into utilising some of these processes at SMP. NII inspectors found the visit helpful and it will assist the NII's assessment of any future SL submissions.

163. Dr Tait reported on Waste Treatment and Decommissioning, and the use of License Condition 35 to regulate decommissioning. As had been mentioned in the NII's latest report, NII plans to regulate decommissioning projects using SL's revised license condition 35 arrangements. NII has worked with SL on the development of these arrangements, and hopes to formally approve the principles associated with these arrangements in the near future. The principles will include the identification of key milestones by SL, and a change process associated with the milestones. Should a key milestone go back, and SL is unable to demonstrate by the change process that all that is reasonably practicable has been done to meet the milestone, then NII may take enforcement action.
164. Moving onto the joint NII / EA Solid Waste Plutonium Contamination Material (PCM). Dr Tait stated that the NII's last report mentioned that the inspection would be carried out. Recently NII led the inspection which covered the production, treatment and storage of the waste. Dr Tait emphasised that SL staff at all levels were both helpful and enthusiastic. Some improvements had taken place since the inspection in 2006, and some areas that require further attention were found.
165. Dr Tait reported on Infrastructure and the proposed joint Sellafield and Windscale Emergency Plan. As part of NII's work to formally approve the plan, NII observed an exercise involving an event on Windscale. NII concentrated on the interactions between Sellafield and Windscale staff, which it found to be satisfactory. NII will now discuss changes to the Emergency Handbook which underpins the plan with Sellafield and Windscale emergency planners with the aim of approving the plan later in the year.
166. Moving onto Severe Accident Management Strategies (SAMS). These documents give guidance to the operators on how to deal with the most infrequent severe accidents, ie: much less frequent than design basis accidents. NII for the past three years has been encouraging SL to introduce these documents, however Dr Tait commented that progress has not been too good and commitments have not been met. SL is now producing a resourced improvement plan, the delivery of which will be monitored by NII.
167. Finally Dr Tait reported on the Control of Major Accident Hazards or COMAH. He explained that the COMAH regulations which cover non nuclear hazards are regulated jointly by HSE and EA. HSE and EA had undertaken joint work in this area, and Andy Mayall of the EA would provide an update a little later in the meeting.
168. **Q: Paul McKenna:** Two parts to the question, firstly you made mention of the quarterly reports which NII has issued for very many years now, is it your intention under your new structure to discontinue these reports, modify them, or replace them with something else?

- 169.**A: Ian Tait:** No, there is no intention to discontinue these reports. There is a mismatch between the timings of these meetings and the NII reporting periods. We have had processes in place now for probably 15 years which require us to produce these quarterly reports within 8 weeks after the end of a quarter and as these meetings take place near the end of a quarter, such as today you are not going to get the reports before the meeting. We have now moved to programme working and this gives us a good opportunity to improve the process for producing the reports and that is what I have done. I have introduced a new process to improve the quality of the reports, and to speed up their production. However even though the reports will be produced earlier, there is still this mismatch between the meeting dates and reporting dates. My aim now is to alter our reporting periods to align them with these meetings. The report content will be basically the same apart from the changes I mentioned earlier where we are trying to make it more readable for members of the public. Fundamentally they will be the same, but they should be more easy to read and should be issued two working weeks before these meetings.
- 170.**Q: Paul McKenna:** That's useful, it's the making it more easy to read that I'm worried about to my mind there isn't a great deal of technical information in these reports this is the only location where you can find information to compare with the operators reports and I feel the committee would be at a disadvantage if this information wasn't available at least maybe through the website or through some other means what we really need is this type of report plus a non technical summary for the committee to look at or some version of that, I feel that if some of this information is retracted from the public domain we would be at a disadvantage?
- 171.**A: Ian Tait:** I am not proposing we should remove any relevant material: we are trying to remove the jargon. Throughout the report you will see acronyms like Thorp and WVP which many of us are familiar with, but people outside in the public will have no idea what Thorp is. The plan is to have a brief summary on a website to explain what each of these facilities are and to have the summary cleared by OCNS because of the security implications. We are not intending to remove information apart from superfluous information.
- 172.**Q: Paul McKenna:** I know what your saying but I cannot agree with this phrase superfluous information, I have a copy of your latest report from the website so it is available to the committee members, it's not numbered but on page 8 section 2.8 on the subject of the legacy ponds and silos, if I may read you a short paragraph which will phrase the question for me. 'specification 325B relating to the removal of 90% of the ILW sludge from the first generation Magnox storage pond comes into effect 1st August 2010, it is apparent that Sellafield Ltd will not be able to meet the specification requirements by the due date and we are currently considering a regulatory position'. To my mind, that phrase is reasonably serious, that sort of information would obviously be in your new framed document, that wouldn't be missing would it?
- 173.**A: Ian Tait:** Well I think Mark Foy gave a good overview of the decision making process we went through the last time we were here in October. I thought he'd given a full account, are you asking for more detail?

174.**Q: Paul McKenna:** Is there any sanction in your mind do you have any sanction?

175.**A: Ian Tait:** Yes, I thought Mark outlined the position at the last meeting in October. We intend to keep these Specifications in place, because the Specifications identify sensible outcomes. However we have found problems with Specifications that cover long timescales such as the removal of a certain waste in say 10 years time. For example a Specification can be based upon the best knowledge at the time, however as a project proceeds technical issues that weren't fully understood can come to light which can make it difficult to meet the Specification. So it is very difficult to issue Specifications looking that far ahead. The existing Specifications will remain in place and if Sellafield Ltd cannot meet a Specification at the due date, we will look into the reasons why the Specification has not been met and use our Enforcement Management Model which is on our website, to decide what action we need to take.

176.**A:** As I mentioned earlier we are now going to use Licence Condition 35 arrangements to regulate decommissioning. The idea is to have key milestones but they will not look 10 years ahead, they will be based on much shorter timescales where the uncertainties are much smaller and so we have a much greater confidence in the ability of the SL to meet the milestones. Sellafield Ltd will produce the milestones and so Sellafield Ltd will own them. We will ensure that a change process is in place and we will hold Sellafield Ltd accountable in terms of delivering to these milestones.

177.**Q: Paul McKenna:** That's useful, so you will be setting short term milestones for them to meet. So that's not what everything would understand as an improvement notice, in the commonly understood term?

178.**A: Ian Tait:** In the extreme, let's say there is a key milestone and Sellafield Ltd, couldn't meet it. Through the change process Sellafield Ltd would produce a submission that justifies why the key milestone needs to go back. If NII wasn't satisfied that Sellafield Ltd had taken all reasonably practicable measures to meet that milestone then in the extreme we could issue an Improvement Notice. In the ultimate we could actually take Sellafield Ltd to court.

179.**Q: Paul McKenna:** The only main point was just that the information should be available if not in the report presented to the committee, then through the website, but certainly available.

180.**Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Following on alone the same topic, it struck me that the report you have just made and have obviously read from it so it was written down, I can't honestly see why that couldn't have been published perhaps three or four days at least on the website, I sat here listening to it thinking how do I respond to that, what is he telling me and with the best will in the world, I'm not up to speed with all the detail, if I can see it written down, I can then go back and look at your reports and make my mind up, as it is I'm just left listening to a lot of words thinking oh I wish it would come to an end quickly. You wrote it down, I used to have to write a progress report every month, it doesn't seem to me to be all that difficult.

181. **A: Ian Tait:** As I mentioned earlier, this is a long standing problem as we have a process we follow. What I have given you are highlights that will appear in the written report when it is produced but there will be a lot more information in the report, I would rather give you a verbal report than nothing and yes I agree it is very difficult and I am trying my best to bring things forward.
182. **Chairman:** The Chairman stated that in fairness discussions had taken place with NII and the committee knew the situation was not going to be resolved before the meeting but it is the intention that the committee will receive a report before the meeting and there will be information available on the website and Dr Tait is trying to get that into line with what the committees requirements are. The committee did also ask that the versions are such that everyone understands them. The Chairman was quite sure if people required more in depth detail the NII would be more than willing to discuss that item with them or make the information available.
183. **Paul McKenna:** The website is a very useful vehicle for placing this information to make it accessible, I think we should make use of it.
184. **Ron Hargreaves:** Is there any legal obstruction to you being able to present to us what you have spoken in a written form.
185. **Ian Tait:** No
186. **Ron Hargreaves:** I would have thought that would have made an excellent progress report to this meeting with references as necessary to the more technical report that is available on the website.
187. **Chairman:** I think we've noted all the comments made on that, it is work in progress. I would rather get it right, we haven't got it right today but we will get it right.
188. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Ian a couple of points, I think obviously it's noted certainly from Prospect and I think I can safely say on behalf of the other unions that the relationship bettering partnership with NMP and with ourselves etc, and we are in a lot more dialogue. Regarding the B215 incident, Prospect, GMB and Unite are very much committed to working with the company and yourselves on ensuring that training is in place, the right training for the job and I'm sure that you've seen that throughout your investigations and I know that isn't concluded yet. The other, leading to a question, I think it is fair to say Prospect share your concerns over the deferrals of high hazard clean up work and although we have a little bit more detail it's somewhat difficult sometimes. When you look into a job and try and assess how long it will take etc. but as you get more and more into that job you realise it uncovers more secrets if you like and more work to be done and at last we are starting to see a real measure of that. We've heard at this committee meeting today both from NMP and NDA regarding there being more of a platform to deliver this work, do you believe that a funding issue will prevent work in the future, ie: will continue with deferral because it is said in the past that although money was available that the company if you want, the vehicle wasn't there to spend it is that going to be the case for the future and I'm talking

specifically about PVP and what discussions you have had with Government etc as a public body?

189.**A: Ian Tait:** I know that there are discussions going on with regards to PVP. I haven't been party to the discussions and I haven't got a line on those discussions that I can give today. On the deferrals, we are looking at the deferrals with SL and SL is producing safety and environmental impact assessments which we are going through to satisfy ourselves that risks from these deferrals are not too high. On the funding side, there is a limited amount of money available for the NDA sites, but a large proportion of the funding is going to Sellafield. I am not able to answer detailed questions on funding.

190.**Q: Paul Shawcross:** The reality is that you are involved as a public body, yourselves and the EA as regulatory bodies and you can raise improvement notices etc. but at the end of the day you still have to go back to Government and say here at Sellafield these are the issues we have got to deal with and you need to ensure that funding is there. There seems to be a disconnect when saying that your not party to any meetings or discussions?

191.**A: Ian Hudson:** Can I answer the question because I have actually been involved with PVP and spent some time with shareholder exec and treasury. Just to take a step back, what does PVP mean (Public Value Programme), so in the normal course of a spending review what you normally do is there are a number of scenarios that explain what you might want to spend or budget would be, you write down the implications of what those budgets would be and you go into negotiations with treasury and they draw a line somewhere and its based upon the practicalities of delivery, its based upon political, socio economic a whole number of things that drive that. The Government tried PVP last year to say they would go through a process of analysing the potential scenarios of what was available going forwards but effectively the decision would be made in the next spending review which is after the next election.

192. So what was required of the NDA because we were more than 50% of DECCS budget was to go through the whole range of scenarios. Government convened what they called a senior PVP panel and in that panel you had senior representatives of the regulators, representatives from treasury, NDA, shareholder exec and DECC policy personnel and through those range of scenarios that were looked at there was an analysis of the criteria set down and one of the really big important criteria that these guys would be aware of is how acceptable is it from a safety perspective because your issue in terms of what you can save in money is always a question of how well can you do it or efficiently and what is the scope, how much work have you got to do. In terms of the scenarios that work is pretty much close to coming to an end, scenarios are identified and the perspectives of those people in the senior PVP panel are reflected of what they think about those particular scenarios.

193. The other pointers as well is that there is a protection in law within the energy act that set NDA up that NDA is still required to provide funding that would meet minimum safety requirements, that's an interesting question, what does that mean, and from a regulatory perspective that's an issue between the regulators and the SLC but there are protections in law to ensure that the funding is

appropriate from a safety perspective as well, so the decision hasn't been made around the PVP process because what will happen is after the next election, new Government will come in and review the budgets, it will open up the box that's called PVP, see the range of scenarios and it'll see the implications associated with those scenarios and the Government at that point would seek to make some decision and they may go back and ask for more information or they may accept the scenarios or draw a line somewhere amongst that lot, so I think there is quite a lot of protection built in at the senior PVP panel to ensure you don't go into a place in terms of scope that you want to do from a safety perspective.

194. **Paul Shawcross:** Thank you both you've answered my question and just echoing my colleagues, I thought it was a very good report and if it had been on the website it would have been even better.

195. **Q: Martin Forwood:** You mentioned in your report the two events in B215, the loss of coolants, one in January this year and one in April last year, I seem to remember in your investigation after the April last year event you requested some improvements/changes to be made to the systems and I just wondered whether those improvements have been implemented at the time of the January incident, if they hadn't been implemented would they have made a difference had they been implemented?

196. **A: Ian Tait:** I'm not sure if these improvements had been implemented..

197. **A: Bill Poulson:** The correctives from the prior incident were implemented, it required implemented nuclear blocking tags and controlled keys for valves, and those were in place and had been done. The corrective actions were implemented it wouldn't and didn't prevent the later incident and as Ian has talked about, the corrective actions regarding additional training and additional aspects for operations is ongoing. The events were very different even though at the top level there was a similar condition but through what was a series of quite different things.

198. **REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**

199. Mr Mayall reported that there were two quarterly reports in member's pack which reported up to the end of March, Mr Mayall endeavoured to update members on anything that had occurred in the two week gap since the issue of the last report.

200. Mr Mayall informed members that this meeting could well be his last meeting for at least 12 months, because he is going on secondment for 12 months. His replacement would be Mr Rob Allott who would be at the next meeting and who would be acting as a Sellafield Team Leader for the next 12 months. Mr Allott already attended the Environmental Health sub committee.

201. Mr Mayall stated that he had very much enjoyed being a member of the group over several years during what had been a very interesting period with many improvements including the website.

202. Mr Mayall reported on Sellafield Strategy and Planning issues and explained that the Environment Agency continues to be engaged at various levels in strategy

and planning issues in relation to the site, EA is represented on the senior PVP panel, and is also represented on a forum that was set up called the Sellafield Remediation forum which is chaired by a Government Minister; that was in response to the acceptance that hazard reduction at the legacy ponds and silos area, in particular, is of national priority.

203. At the site level EA continue to be engaged in the discussions surrounding the life time plan developments, Mr Mayall explained that the life time plan is composed essentially of two separate parts, the first part is the contract baseline which sets out what is the baseline of what should be achieved and the second part is the performance plan which is still under development and will incentivise improvements over the baseline to accelerate hazard reduction and bring forward some of the dates in the contract baseline.
204. Mr Mayall continued that as part of that process the regulators have been recommending for some time a more transparent and visible programme is put together which could be placed in the public domain and which deals with high hazard reduction elements of the life time plan, this has become known as the high hazard risk reduction programme. That part of the work is still ongoing, EA has seen an early draft of that programme and believes that the plan is to make that public domain later in the summer and hopefully that will create more visibility and transparency surrounding the various high hazard parts of the life time plan, and will hopefully enable more meaningful engagement around those particular parts of the plan.
205. Moving onto permitting issues, Mr Mayall stated that he had previously reported that EA has undertaken a public consultation on changes to the RSA authorisation, that was completed in February and since then EA has considered the various responses made to the consultation and formulated its decision and Mr Mayall was pleased to say EA issued the authorisation yesterday to become effective today (1st April 2010).
206. Mr Mayall did not intend to go into a lot of detail on what the changes were as they had been set out at the previous meeting, he stated that the key changes were an increase to the site limit for Antimony 125 to air, but also EA has reduced quite a number of other site limits and individual facility limits also. EA also authorised a new transfer route for low-level contaminated oils to go for incineration to a facility in Hampshire.
207. With regards to the LLW disposals Mr Mayall referred to the decision recently by DECC that new landfill sites that propose to accept radioactive waste will need Article 37 opinions from the European Commission. Mr Mayall reported that this will introduce a delay into the processes surrounding various applications that have been made nationally for such facilities including one in Cumbria at Lillyhall, so although EA has received an application for the RSA authorisation, that process will effectively have to go on hold now until the Article 37 opinion is received.
208. Mr Mayall reported that the EA issued a minor variation to the facility limits at the Thorp facility back in December to increase some limits there to allow

increase pond purge at the receipt and storage facility with the aim of reducing the level of corrosive ions in the pond water.

209. Mr Mayall continued that there is a separate permit for non radioactive discharges, and EA has received an application from Sellafield to change or vary that particular permit, they are not particularly major changes but EA is conducting a review and determination process on that.
210. On a more general theme Mr Mayall reported that the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 will become law the week following this meeting, which in summary will mean that what was previously referred to as a radioactive substances act authorisation will become known as an environmental permit. There are no real changes in terms of the limits and conditions in the permit but the change in regulations is part of the Government's intention to unify the various environmental permitting regimes and this is another step in that process.
211. Referring to VLLW disposals on Sellafield site, Mr Mayall stated that EA has asked the site for an updated Environmental safety case in relation to the on-site landfill facilities. Over the years there has been some on-site disposals in facilities there and EA is asking for an updated environmental safety case for those facilities and also in conjunction with that an updated long term landfill strategy for the site to see how landfill disposal at the site fits into the bigger picture of the LLW disposals and indeed how that will fit in with the end states plans and strategies for the Sellafield site.
212. Mr Mayall moved onto the topic of inspections and explained that the EA reports detail a number of inspections, one that Mr Mayall wished to highlight and had already been mentioned was the first part of a joint inspection programme with NII looking at solid wastes at the site, the first step was taken recently and involved looking at PCM waste and EA hope to be in a position to produce a report on that in May.
213. Later in the year EA will be doing various other joint inspections on solid waste looking at other forms of intermediate level wastes, solid waste strategy and low level waste.
214. Referring to COMAH regulations, the control of major accident hazards, Mr Mayall explained these regulations relate to the hazards from non radioactive substances rather than the radiological inventory at the site. There are two tiers in the regulations which require different things, Sellafield has traditionally been a lower tier site because its maximum declared inventories of chemicals were below a certain threshold. Recently Sellafield carried out a review of quantities of certain chemicals across the site and discovered that when they added them together there was potential for them to come out above the top tier thresholds for certain substances such as the gas, oil which is stored at the combined heat and power plant for example. The fact that potential stocks have gone above these thresholds does not indicate an increased risk from the site or failure to manage the stocks properly but failure to notify the joint competent authority has been considered as an administrative breach and the joint competent authority ie: HSE and EA has written to the company requiring the situation to be remedied. Sellafield's intention is to put various measures in place to ensure that they do

not exceed those thresholds but at the same time EA and the NII are very keen to ensure that in doing that they are not compromising nuclear safety. EA and NII will continue to monitor Sellafield's progress in this area.

215. Onto environmental monitoring and in particular the beach monitoring, Mr Mayall confirmed beach monitoring continues to be successful, there has been a recent upgrade in the detector capability on the Groundhog machine that is visible on the beach from time to time and it continues to make finds of contaminated particles. Mr Mayall reported that the level of radioactivity in those particles is still less than would cause concern when considered against recent Health Protection Agency advice and therefore the advice given so far still remains that no special measures are necessary in relation to beach usage.
216. Mr Mayall updated the committee that the EA has now published a response strategy to the beach monitoring finds which sets out what different actions might be taken to a certain nature of finds on the beach, that is now published on the EA website and it has been shared previously with local authorities and various other stakeholders.
217. Mr Mayall reported that in terms of LLWR, EA continues to inspect progress with vault 9 construction looking at Quality Assurance aspects of construction for example. EA is also continuing to be engaged with the company on the environmental safety case submission, it is important that when it arrives in May next year that there are no surprises and EA is already very familiar with the content and hopefully meets requirements from day one, which will mean that the determination period will be as short as possible and hopefully not take 4 years as was the case for the previous one submission in 2002.
218. **Q: Ranald Stewart:** On the quarterly report to 31st December, the very last paragraph page 12 talks about elevated levels of nitrate have been found close to the river Calder. The groundwater monitoring at this location has been increased to a monthly sampling frequency, can you tell me what the results of those have been?
219. **A: Andy Mayall:** I don't have the numbers to hand but I can certainly provide some in writing if that is suitable.
- 220. ACTION: Mr Mayall to provide in writing results of groundwater monitoring close to the river Calder.**
221. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Mr Mayall for the help and support he had given to the WCSSG committee over the years and wished him well in his secondment.
- 222. ITEM 10 – SUMMARY REPORTS FROM THE SUB COMMITTEES**
- 223. LOW LEVEL WASTE SUB COMMITTEE**
224. Nothing to add to distributed report and no questions
- 225. SOCIO ECONOMIC SUB COMMITTEE**

226.Nothing to add to distributed report and no questions

227.COMMERCIAL SUB COMMITTEE

228.Cllr Davidson had nothing to add to the report but commented that during the last Commercial sub committee members had requested some documentation referring to the financial reports and they were finally received at the weekend just gone, a little quicker would have been appreciated.

229.**Q: Martin Forwood:** Just a comment Chairman please, I know these aren't the minutes of that Commercial Operations meeting but the actual minutes on the website are not in fact an accurate representation of the meeting, there were a number of questions from members of the committee, Paul Shawcross asked one on a range of issues and none of those questions or answers are reflected in the minutes which I think is a pity.

230.**A: Chairman:** Thanks for that comment, Mike as the Chair, through the secretariat of that committee will have a look at the minutes and obviously when the committee meets next time if those aren't a true record they will need to be brought up to date.

231.**A: Mike Davidson:** Indeed so Chairman and I will have a word with the secretariat and check exactly what the procedure is.

232.**ACTION:** Mike Davidson to speak with Commercial Sub Committee Secretariat and discuss format for minutes.

233.DECOMMISSIONING SUB COMMITTEE:

234.Cllr Clarkson apologised to the Chairman and the committee and visitors for not having a report which was due to an administration breakdown. Himself, and the deputy Chairman Ron Hargreaves had a useful quarterly meeting with Russ Mellor and Paul Foster which as usual was very interesting and informative.

235.EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE:

236.Cllr Moore reported that with regard to the special meeting which was held looking at new build the actions from that meeting were for the committee to write into the consultation and express concerns with regards to, and highlighting the infrastructure of West Cumbria.

237.Cllr Moore thanked all the personnel involved in the Oscar 9 exercise, it had involved a great number of people and a lot of agencies. He stated that arranging an exercise like Oscar 9 takes a big commitment from the site and all the supporting agencies. There were a lot of learning points from the exercise and there is a comprehensive report available.

238.Cllr Moore reported that the issue of CNC and its continued commitment to West Cumbria was raised at the meeting and CNC has quite clearly given that commitment and confirmed there will be no job losses as a result of the moves they are undertaking in terms of relocating parts of the training school.

239. David Humphrey's reported on the site siren: There was a meeting held on the morning of the WCSSG meeting (1st April 2010) and Mr Humphrey's wished to update members on it. The current emergency siren system is now 50 years old and becoming unreliable, Sellafield has installed a new £1million pound state of the art system, which was tested on the 24th March for the first time and Mr Humphrey's was happy to report that the results of that test was very satisfactory. He confirmed with members that the specification is to alert the site and the 2km zone down wind to 85 decibels and a lot of people fed back they can hear it but there is a clear specification that had to be met. Mr Humphreys was pleased to report that it was audible outside and there are reports that it was audible in some areas up to Thornhill.
240. Following that successful test, Mr Humphreys was pleased to report that the new system will become operational at midnight on 26th May 2010, and that is the date where the old system will be turned off and the new system will be available for use. Mr Humphreys reiterated there will be two different noises, a warbling noise to indicate a site incident and the more traditional rising and falling noise to indicate a Sellafield emergency, both sirens will be re-enforced by voice messages.
241. He continued that there are a number of things that will take place before the 26th May, firstly there will be a free phone telephone line that any member of the public can ring and hear an example of both tones and what they mean, that will be published shortly and also there will be a new issue of the householders leaflet to everyone within the 6km zone before the 26th May which contains updated information particularly on sirens.
242. In conclusion Mr Humphreys reported that there will be a site exercise on the morning of May 27th where it is very likely that the site sirens will be sounded and a notice to that effect will be within the covering letter to the leaflet and also in the Whitehaven News.
243. The Chairman added that the Emergency Planning sub committee had worked long and hard to secure the sirens, he heard them during the testing and he had tried the telephone help line and they were both working.
244. **ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE: - PROF HAYWOOD**
245. Professor Haywood had very little to add other than anyone who visits the website and reads the EHSC minutes will know that the committee covers an awful lot of ground and that the report distributed to members is simply an abstract of those things which the committee considers most significant to the local community.
246. **Q: Sue Brown:** with regard to the action down at the bottom of the page, it refers to early 2009, advice was sort from COMARE about the study rates of Leukaemia in Germany and I wondered if the sub committee received a report or how they received information regarding that. I see that has been taken forward to the Department of Health who again are seeking information, presumably all this will come back to that sub committee because I would like to see sight of any details coming out of Germany?

247.**A: Prof Haywood:** Thank you for that question, yes the sub committee is also anxious to see a response to this however it is important to understand that COMARE may take some time to absorb the German evidence into the very large body of other evidence which already exists and at present we are no further forward.

248.ITEM 11 – VOTE FOR CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

249.Councillor David Moore was re-elected as Chairman of the WCSSG and Councillor Elaine Woodburn was re-elected for the position of Vice Chair of the WCSSG. Both posts will run for a two year period.

250.The Chairman thanked members for their support and stated that it is quite an enjoyable job but requires a lot of hard work. When he attended the National Stakeholder Group looking at the work levels of all the various sites other Chairs and Vice Chairs were quite amazed when Cllr Moore gave the WCSSG report of how many meetings the committee and all the sub committee's had as some of the other sites only have two meetings a year. He thanked members for their support in re-electing both him and Cllr Woodburn.

251.The next event of the WCSSG will be Thursday 1st July at Cleator Moor Civic Hall and the next scrutiny meeting will be 7th October 2010 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall.