

**MINUTES OF THE 11th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT CLEATOR MOOR CIVIC AND MASONIC CENTRE
ON THURSDAY 7TH OCTOBER 2010**

Present:

Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Mr R Anderson	-	National Nuclear Laboratory
Cllr T Knowles	-	Cumbria County Council
Lynne Blackburn	-	CNC
Lindsay Gray	-	Churches Forum
Mr J M Powe	-	St John's Parish Council
Mr P Clements	-	Prospect
Mr J A Clark	-	Prospect
Mr Ranald Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Mr R Hargreaves	-	Community representative
Professor S Jones	-	Independent Consultant
Prof J Haywood	-	Chairman, Environmental Health sub committee
Mr Brian Hough	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr Phil Edge	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr Rob Allott	-	Environment Agency
Dr I Tait	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Ms Alyson Armett	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr R Raaz	-	LLWR
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Vice Chairman
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Ms S Williams	-	WCSSG Secretariat
Mr Todd Wright	-	Sellafield Limited
Mr I Irving	-	Sellafield Limited
Mr P Fryer	-	Studsvik UK
Cllr P Tyson	-	Whitehaven Trades Council
Cllr S Brown	-	Cumbria County Council
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Cllr M Davidson	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr P Mann	-	Sellafield Ltd
Mrs J O'Reilly	-	Copeland Borough council
Peter Connelly	-	Copeland Borough Council

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. He also welcomed Mr Roger Anderson who was a new member representing National Nuclear Laboratories.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 01 APRIL 2010

4. There were no amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 1st April 2010.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

5. The Chairman reported on the forthcoming WCSSG review that the NDA has instigated for all stakeholder groups as they have now been in operation for 5 years. The Chairman commented that the WCSSG reviews its progress and makes changes in order to keep the group dynamic and fresh routinely, however for the NDA review the WCSSG has appointed an external consultant David Collier who was in attendance at the meeting. The review is a full review and anybody that wanted to raise any issues could do so with Mr Collier at the meeting, he would also be contacting some members again in the future. The report that Mr Collier compiles will be brought back to the full stakeholder group for agreement. The Chairman felt it was important to carry out the review as there are always things to be learned from other areas and could identify areas for improvement.
6. The Chairman wished to update members on the position with Managing Radioactive Waste Safely, The Chairman sits on the committee representing WCSSG and he reported that his role on that group is to feed information back through WCSSG processes to members. The Chairman reported that he had sent a letter to the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely committee explaining that in his role he represents a broad group of people and therefore it was unlikely that he would be responding into that process on behalf of the group but just feeding information back to WCSSG members.
7. The Chairman reported that he was disappointed at the cancellation of the Low Level Waste sub committee. He understood it was for reasons of lack of attendance, he reminded members that information and dates for all the meetings are available 12 months in advance and as such the sub committee’s should try and ensure that all meetings take place. It was not the first, there had been one that had been postponed and he just wished to make it clear that he really did not want to see meetings cancelled if at all possible.
8. The Chairman reported that he, along with several WCSSG members attended the National Stakeholder Group meeting. He felt it was quite clear that those meetings are now coming to an end. Members were left unsure when they left the venue when or where the next stakeholder Group gathering would be. NDA had indicated that there would be opportunities for all sites to gather together to hold discussions but it is clear that it is the end of the two national stakeholder

group meetings that are held now. Part of the reason for those changes were cost savings as well as how efficient it was and whether it was delivering what the members required.

9. The Chairman reported that the WCSSG special meeting planned for 26th October is a joint meeting with the local authorities the aim of which is to look at the NDA Strategy II document. The aim of the meeting is to provide people with the information required to enable them to go back to their organisations and hopefully try and get a strong response back from West Cumbria into Strategy II. The Chairman commented that there are a lot of areas within the strategy that would be beneficial to West Cumbria and he felt that wherever possible the community need to take those opportunities to try and influence what is best for the area. The Chairman reported that Tony Fountain, NDA Chief Executive has agreed to attend the meeting so it will be an opportunity to meet the new CEO and hear some of his views and comments as he opens up the Strategy meeting.
10. **Dick Raaz:** Apologised to the Chairman for the cancellation of the LLW sub committee meeting. The decision had been made due to a lack of response from members of that sub committee in attending. Mr Raaz commented that time of year was proving difficult but he would take the action to sound out attendance further in advance because it only came to light some 48 hours prior to the meeting how low the numbers were.
11. **Tim Knowles:** was delighted to hear that there is going to be a review and an opportunity to input into the terms of reference.
12. He continued that it was a matter of record that the County Council does not feel that the organisation is the most effective mechanism for engaging with the community and that it is not compatible with the mechanisms currently in place with the local authorities for forming policy. He felt that there was some concern that the organisation is facilitated and the secretariat provided by the SLC's in terms of the level of independence. He also stated that the County Council also has issues about whether or not independent Chairmanship would be more appropriate. He also mentioned in terms of cost in these days when all the public sector is facing massive costs the spectacle of people being chauffeured to Manchester and spending long amounts of time in the most expensive hotel in the area seem to him to be unacceptable.
13. He reported that he felt there was concern that the organisation had grown a lot and questioned its relevance. He felt the organisation which was invented in 1979 had barely changed since. In conclusion he thought there was a question of relevance, structure, cost and independence and he hoped the review could look into all of those issues.
14. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Mr Knowles for his comments and commented that the opportunity was available for him to feed those concerns into the review. He was certain that not everyone in the room actually agreed with the comments that he had made, the group had changed from the Sellafeld Local Liaison Committee five years ago when it became a stakeholder group and it had become more open and more transparent. He knew there would be differences about how well people felt the committee worked or how well it fits into the

system, but he felt that given the attendance at the meeting it showed that people clearly believe it is an opportunity to ask questions and carry out some scrutiny of the nuclear industry and that there was a lot of support for it. He re-iterated that Mr Knowles was more than welcome to join the group that looks at the terms of reference for the review with the results of the review would be brought back to the full committee for all the members to see.

15. **Mike Davidson:** Commented on the secretariat and the way in which the secretariat works, like Mr Knowles when he first came into the organisation, he had very great doubts as to whether the secretariat could be in any way independent, in fact he has been absolutely astonished at the encouragement that Chairs have had from the secretariat to ask the difficult and awkward questions and he personally offered his thanks to them for the way that they have supported him in the last few years.
16. **Elaine Woodburn:** Commented that if the conversation commenced the committee was in real danger of trying to pre-empt what is going to come out of the review. She felt that the Chair had quite rightly said there will be different opinions around the table around how well or not people view the group. She thought it is quite right that there is a review of it. She asked if the group that is going to look at the terms of reference could send out the results to all members so that the whole group sees it.
17. **Chairman:** The Chairman commented that he would look forward to members putting themselves forward and asked if people could let the secretariat know if they would like to sit on that group putting forward the terms of reference. He reported that it was open to anyone that feels they would like to be involved. He agreed happily to circulate those around all members and it would give David Collier a clear steer on the exact terms the group want him to look at.
18. **AGENDA ITEM 4A – REPORT FROM SELLAFIELD LTD – TODD WRIGHT**
19. Mr Wright offered Bill Poulson’s apologies as he was unable to attend the meeting due to another commitment.
20. Mr Wright began by saying that the key focus at Sellafield is hazard reduction and progress towards that and his intention was to update the committee in that regard, he had a few achievements that he wished to show in order to provide some clarity as to where Sellafield Limited is operationally.
21. In the past there has been a request by the committee to talk about where Sellafield Ltd is in terms of production targets versus expected, Mr Wright showed a slide summarising Thorp, Magnox, SMP and Vitrification which highlighted the actual target against progress. The slide showed Magnox behind target due to receipt issues which have been worked through. The site is making progress again in that regard.
22. Mr Wright reported that Vitrification is not meeting targets and the site had a series of operational issues with refurbishments within the Vitrification plant that it is working through. Line 2 was close to restart but the site is working on some

issues with and is close to putting the Vitrification plant back on line. In summary there have been a series of maintenance activities and emerging items that the site has had to overcome in putting the line back up.

23. Continuing on, Mr Wright reported that the B241 floc recovery programme is slightly behind programme but it is at the point that if the site continues on target for the rest of the year it will be recoverable.
24. The next four slides Mr Wright showed were from the legacy ponds and silos area and were intended to show, firstly the critical path activities in support of each one of those major work streams and secondly to highlight the amount of effort going into the development of underpinning for putting those critical path schedules together, both for the near term and for the planning that is coming from development of the life time plan 10 as well as performance plans. There are performance plans for these areas that will be delivered at the end of this month.
25. There were similar slides for the first generation Magnox storage pond, the pond fuel storage pond and also for the silos storage facility.
26. There was also in the presentation a series of diagrams, Mr Wright explained that this was to articulate the advancement of risk reduction that will be achieved in comparison to the life time plan or the baseline plan. The life time plan is built as a baseline but what Sellafield Ltd will be working to is the performance plan. He acknowledged that it was highly simplified and the reason for it was to articulate what those key milestones will be and to disseminate how that will be reflected opposite the corresponding risk reduction. There were four slides highlighting this.
27. Mr Wright continued that one of the questions always asked and justifiably so, is how progress is being measured. There are a variety of ways of doing it, there is no simple way to do it, but he thought one of the most important ones is safety and what progress is being made against safety. One of the things Sellafield Ltd has done this year is put together a strategic plan, it is the first time that has been done for safety and Mr Wright thought it had been done quite well. Sellafield Ltd also began the peer to peer observation programme in April and as a result had achieved over 16,000 observations. Mr Wright pointed out that the purpose of peer to peer observations is not new to Nuclear Management Partners or in industry. Peer to Peer quite simply is for employees to be watching out for each other. Mr Wright continued that since April Sellafield Ltd has worked over four million hours without a lost time accident and he felt that, in part is highly reflective in the investment and activity that has gone into the peer to peer process.
28. Mr Wright showed a slide highlighting some of the key milestones that have been achieved starting from November 2008 going forward. He commented that there were quite an impressive string of accomplishments and the site is pleased with that. He explained that most recently was the completion of the Sellafield Product Residue Store (SPRS) facility which is undergoing commissioning; Sellafield Ltd has planned for the first can to be transferred into that facility in December of this year (2010).

29. The major construction project, evaporator D is well under construction and is 40 weeks ahead of schedule. It is a major construction activity and the committee was well aware of the issues concerned with the aging fleet of evaporators that currently exist at Sellafield; so evaporator D is a very important infrastructure replacement that is necessary for ongoing operations and the clean up that must continue to occur.
30. In terms of prioritising resources, Mr Wright was pleased to report to the committee that Sellafield Ltd has finished the last phase of high risk activity associated with decommissioning at Windscale with the work completed last month. As a result of that the site has been able to redeploy the resources from that facility to other high activity decommissioning work on site. Mr Wright stated that it is important in the current challenging times of pressed funding to prioritise and ensure that the site is concentrating on the most pressing items and highest priorities at Sellafield.
31. Mr Wright continued his presentation by reporting on accomplishments and highlighted a few, one being the pile fuel storage silo new off gas system was commissioned which changed from the previous configuration to one of a pressurised system, resulting in a 50% reduction in Argon. Mr Wright emphasised that more importantly it was a necessary change in configuration to enable the actual retrieval to occur and that key step was necessary to enable that part of the planning to proceed forward.
32. Mr Wright went on to report that the site has also continued with transfers from the Magnox Swarf Silo which is essentially a transfer of high level liquor for down stream processing, which is risk reduction, in that it is taking it from a mobile form to an immobile form.
33. Talking about the internal progress to Sellafield in changing from a process culture to a performance culture, Mr Wright stated that one of the things to recognise, in terms of measuring change is that sometimes change is not measured so much in a quantum measure, but it is a thousand little changes that have significant impact over time and he would characterise the changes that are being made at Sellafield and various parts of the organisation as this.
34. He continued that the site is also striving to be a good neighbour, and that it is very important to the site and its parent companies. It is also important that the site continues to review progress in that area and to re-evaluate and continue to support it.
35. Mr Wright continued that the site has many challenges ahead, firstly continuing to work through the voluntary severance. He explained that it had been a very deliberate process that followed fully the management of change process.
36. He reported that there are issues that are effecting plant operations in particular in the high level waste area and the site is working through that and has addressed the resources in support of that.
37. The site continues to accelerate recent progress in legacy ponds and silos.

38. Mr Wright also reported that another area is building confidence in the regulatory community. There are changes that the site is making and proposing and changes that are already ongoing. The site has to continue to work with the regulators to earn and gain their confidence not only in what Sellafield Ltd is proposing but also demonstrated every day by what they see as they do their inspections.
39. Mr Wright continued that Sellafield Ltd also wants to ensure transparency with its customers and the community by ensuring that there is good communication and available information allowing understanding about what is going on at the site and what lies ahead.
40. Mr Wright reported that the site had a good Summer, despite some of the operational set backs, and it wanted to continue to build on that and make progress going into next year.
41. Longer term, it is about supporting the integrated change programme which is working well and also the transitions with mobility and continuing to move and transition people to the high priority tasks. Also, in terms of the improvements in asset management, Mr Wright commented that there are people behind the scenes doing excellent work making improvements for the longevity of the critical infrastructure that support nuclear operations.
42. In Summary, Mr Wright reported that foundationally the site is looking to build and continue on the success of Sellafield Ltd, supported by the parent companies, leading to new missions. Mr Wright commented that the site feels that the way to achieve new missions is to demonstrate, not by what it says but what it does, to achieve and demonstrate and in doing that over time that enables the decision makers (Government) to make an informed, quality decision that is reflective of all the great beneficial work that has been done leading to a sustainable future for West Cumbria.
43. **Q: John Powe:** Thank you Mr Wright for a very clear and concise report, the term – ‘it doesn’t matter how hard you work on the field, what matters is how many times you score’ rings through my mind from the last meeting when Mr Poulson gave his report. I’m pleased to hear that you are moving from a processed culture to a performance culture and I am really pleased to see that you have put some targets up in graphic form and gone away from a lot of the wordy documents. I would appeal to you, in your April report you said there were 19 key metrics that you measure yourself against, I would appeal for key performance indicators to be displayed and I would like the key performance indicators to look back maybe five or six years and look forward six years with the purpose of being able to make a judgement on how well you are performing compared to other management teams; because you were brought in with the expectation you would out perform those who were running the site before, so I would personally like to be able to see that in performance terms. I would also like the KPI’s to look forward five or six years so we are not just getting a snap shot we are getting a panorama view if you like, so that we can make a judgement on one of the strap lines that you have been using that you are going to do six years for five. So that is my appeal to you, I would like to see clearer graphical, factual information and less words reported.

44. On two specific issues, evaporator D we had an excellent presentation at the last stakeholder meeting and I loved the innovation that was put forward in that, but again there wasn't a finish date issued at the meeting and there are no key milestones and today again you have said, we are 40 weeks ahead of schedule. I would like to see big projects like that laid out over the period until it comes on line in 2014, it would be good to have it broken down, what are the key milestones every six months up until then and again we can make our own judgement how well you are performing on the site.
45. A final issue if you will allow me, in the April report you are claiming to increase the loading factor on vitrification drums by 20%, (this is more aimed at the NDA) has that been independently verified because it is a very difficult thing to measure. I would love it if you have actually achieved it but I would like to see some independent verification that that is actually the case, because you are claiming significant improvements in that area and from my perspective without independent evidence to support it.
46. **A: Todd Wright:** First I agree that brevity is the soul of wit, so I agree with you that having concise key performance indicators is very appropriate. As far as key milestones, it will be very easy to accommodate that and a lot of times that information is available, we are trying to acknowledge the presentation and to keep the presentation crisp but that is very easy to accommodate that.
47. As far as the independent review of the loading in glass, as you know depending on who the customer is in some cases there is the review that the customer does too so that is something that we can get back to you on and address and I will ask the NDA if they would like to comment?
48. **A: Brian Hough:** I don't think we can answer that question today, but as Todd says we can take that away and provide an answer as soon as we can.
49. **Chairman:** can that be copied to all members please, and as you know I think we join the frustration of wanting that performance plan desperately that we know you are currently working on with those milestones in so we can check on and be able to judge ourselves how you are achieving those milestones, so we bear some of that frustration that that information is not there yet.
50. **Brian Hough:** If I could just pick up on that point Chairman. If you remember at the last meeting we did talk about the production of a much more stakeholder focused version of the Sellafield plan once it is completed and indeed our intention is that will include all of those key performance indicators and milestones and then we can use that as a basis against which we can report back to this group, so that should enable you to chart progress over the period of that plans delivery.
51. **Chairman:** Yes I think our frustration is that it was a 2010 plan and 2010 is running out fairly quickly, I think what we would like is somebody to be able to tell us when we are going to see that plan.
52. **Brian Hough:** It's covered in the NDA report but I'm happy to deal with it now.

53. **Chairman:** we'll leave it for you to cover in the NDA report
54. **Q: Peter Clements:** Todd I make no apologies for repeating this for the benefit of the committee. You mentioned about the way forward and one of the things you said is driving forward the voluntary severance to the end point. Again as the trade unions have said in the past the end point isn't just getting 800 people out of the gates, the end point has to be looking after the people who are left to continue on the work. We need to spend as much time making sure that we don't send people home in a stressed state, and overworked state, because they are now doing the same work, with 800 people less to do it. It is just a point, certainly I'm sure the NDA, the NII but more importantly the trade unions and the people we represent will be making sure that you deliver on that promise as well.
55. **A: Todd Wright:** Thanks for that Peter, I totally agree with you, it is not intentional but sometimes you can forget that there are people that are left behind and those people that are still working not only are they still working but they have friends and colleagues who have left, so there is not just the professional side but a social element of that. So I think being sensitive to it and paying close attention to it is important and we are doing that and will continue to do that. But I agree with you totally.
56. **Elaine Woodburn:** Just a comment unless I did miss it, there was no mention of the community within your presentation and about the importance of the community and I think when you refer to regulators you probably don't include local authorities within that. My question is on the assisted travel arrangements, I am slightly concerned that the company has made a premature decision, large employees should be wanting to deliver a travel plan, now in fairness to Sellafield they have grasped that and are working with us on it, but one of the targets I would imagine within a travel plan will be to reduce the number of cars that are actually on the road and I sat down with Bill Poulson who on numerous occasions has said about resources that are lost because of the amount of time if anything happens on the roads the length of time its taken for people to get into work. So on the basis that you will have a travel plan likely to have targets in it to reduce the number of cars do you not think it is slightly premature to remove a scheme that we would have hoped would actually be used more and I'm not quite sure if it is in here, I'm maybe not getting this right I'm sure somebody from the County can probably help me on it, but I was under the impression that these services when they have left the Sellafield site were then being used as a public service and coming into the local community and taking people from that area right through to Whitehaven and further and I'm not sure whether that is being considered that once you take away the subsidy those buses as well as being lost for people to get to the site are actually a loss for the local community as well?
57. **Ian Irving:** Thanks Elaine, first of all in terms of the point about involving the communities, we did have a section in the presentation there about local communities, how we are striving to be a good neighbour and how we recognise we need to continue to engage with the community and community representatives to improve that process, so that is very much understood and recognised.

58. In terms of the travel plan, you are quite right, we do have a travel plan that has been submitted to the council that does involve taking a number of cars off the road over a period of time. We are looking at various ways and means of achieving that. In terms of the assisted travel itself it was a scheme which was very much under utilised so what we are looking at is how we can implement more effective ways of achieving the end result that we are all after, more cost effective results and services that people want and people will get the benefit from. So while I understand that there may be some question, that is a small part of it in the overall scheme we are looking very much about committing to a travel plan that will achieve the end result that the Council desires.
59. **Tim Knowles:** One of my responsibilities on the County Council is transport. There is work going on between County Council transport officers and Sellafield Ltd in respect of a travel plan, I have not made any public announcements on this in the past, as with one or two other things I wasn't desperately happy when the announcement of the withdrawal of the services was made prior to any proper strategic thinking being given to the impact to the community, things like volumes of vehicles, impacts on communities with the loss of transport services and obviously we now live in the world of climate change and CO2 reduction and anything that will reduce that massive flood of vehicles going to and from Sellafield every day needs to be seriously thought about not just in terms of the bottom line of operational costs. I'm happy to say there is now a constructive dialogue going on and hopefully we will end up with a credible arrangement at the end of it, I think it is something that some of the things that we talk about in this committee are a trifle obscure, this sort of thing is very relevant to everybody who lives in this community and I say again it should be thought about in the round rather than in the terms of financial criteria first, but there is work going on and hopefully it will produce an appropriate result.
60. **Peter Clements:** I can just add a couple of comments on what you have said regarding the assisted travel, it is fair to say that the buses were under utilised, the buses bring people to site, however since stagecoach has introduced a non subsidised travel plan for buses coming to site they have actually had to put more buses on because it is over subscribed. It isn't true to say however that the train service too and from site was under utilised, we have been asking the company to ask North West Rail to put on more train carriages because the train carriages that we have at the moment are overcrowded and people are having to stand from Barrow and Millom to get to site, so it is fair to say that the buses that we had were underutilised but the train service certainly wasn't however, the way this was pushed through was unacceptable to us, however you have gone ahead and done it, I just don't want you to put up a false picture of why you did it.
61. **Iain Irving:** Certainly the train service Peter is something that we would be encouraging, I think we all saw at the time of the floods when the extra train service was put on how well it was utilised so certainly in terms of all the discussions we have had with the Council through the travel plan a train service is definitely something that we would all like to see, easier said than done is the reality of it, but that is something that we are looking at very seriously.

62. **Mike Davidson:** Thanks Chair could I just enter a plea that those North of the site both in Workington and in Cockermouth be included in this travel plan and particular attention paid to that 'race track' which exists across the fell route.
63. **John Powe:** Mine is the same, just an appeal from Beckermeth Parish Council both to you and to Copeland and at County level that the villages near to the site are considered. We are your closest neighbour North and we have two real problems, one is speeding traffic through the village never mind across Cold Fell where there are children walking not sheep and the last survey we did 45% of cars at muster time in and out exceeded the speed limit with a vast number exceeding 45 miles per hour through the village. Since the policy to have more than one passenger in the car was initiated, people speed through the top of the village and then park in the bottom of the village and are picked up by one of their colleagues so we have two immediate problems in the vicinity of Sellafield and as your nearest Northern neighbour, I really need to talk to you about this in more detail outside of the meeting Iain.
64. **Iain Irving:** We'll do that John.
65. **Peter Connolly:** The village in which I live, all the traffic from the North comes through it, the road highways department in their wisdom keep closing the road, so therefore the traffic is thrown onto the cold fell road, the road works at Parkside bridge have taken a very long time to dig. The lights have been there for months and when they take them away they put another set up further along. So I am wondering if there is any sort of work between you and the highways department on when road closures happen, where is your traffic going to go to get to Sellafield?
66. **Chairman:** I think those points have been picked up, I'm not sure that Sellafield can resolve those, maybe you want to have a discussion with Councillor Knowles outside the meeting or United Utilities.
67. **Todd Wright:** Let me make one comment, this issue of transportation, of course it is critical and there are times that it is more critical than others and I think sometimes it gets critical when maybe people would not anticipate that it was critical and so this is the kind of dialogue that obviously we will take away and work more on if there is a lot of work that has been done, but the dimensions of it are far reaching and also the impact is very important and we appreciate and understand that.
68. **Ranald Stewart:** I would like to further comment on the problems of transport over cold fell, I am representing Ponsonby Parish Council and also sit on the cold fell action community group. In today's paper there was a letter from our Chairman Muir Lachlan indicating that a farmer had suffered or experienced a further four sheep being killed this last week. We have a problem on the fell in terms of sustaining the farmers whose livelihood is dependant on the fell. So it is to support what has been said before.
69. **Elaine Woodburn:** Just to clarify something, before everybody thinks we are going to have this 400 page transport plan of all the transport issues with regard to Sellafield, what it actually is, is in regards to a planning application that is

coming in and it is actually a green transport plan which will look at getting cars off the road and utilising other forms including rail and cycling, it will not go into all the transport issues with regard to Sellafield, but I am now heartened by Todd offering to extend or to carry out a new study which actually might do that and take on board some of the wider issues, but I don't want everyone to go away thinking this transport plan is going to have all the answers, its not but I think I did hear Todd saying they would do one.

70. **Todd Wright:** Yes we will support that.
71. **Joe Clark:** A comment to Mr Wright about the aspirational nature of attracting new missions for Sellafield, given that we are unlikely to see a single building demolished certainly probably in my lifetime and given that the site is divesting itself of a vast array of knowledge and skill, do you really think you are creating a condition that will attract new missions to Sellafield?
72. **Todd Wright:** I think to appreciate that you need to not look at a snap shot of today I think you need to look strategically at where we are going and what things are going to look like and how Sellafield is going to look three or five years from now, so I appreciate the comment and I understand the context by which you refer but the change and the expectations that we have for performance in where we are now, versus where we want to be are going to be different so I think that, in itself is not going to happen overnight so if I would, I would ask that you consider where it is going to be but not where we are today.
73. **Martin Forwood:** Can I just ask a couple of questions on operational matters please, the first one is on evaporator D, you talk about being 40 weeks ahead of schedule, but I noticed in the NDA's report today, they talk about what appears to be a problem with the evaporator D module side of life, so is your programme at Sellafield 40 weeks ahead but not the actual module project itself?
74. **Todd Wright:** The overall project that I am referring to, the overall project is 40 weeks ahead it was not referring to any sub-tiered element of that, it is the overall schedule.
75. **Alyson Armett:** Todd is correct there, we have set them in year targets and there is a problem with one of the in-year targets but at the moment we don't see that the overall end point is at risk.
76. **Martin Forward:** The second question is about these wall charts which I also welcome very much, it is nice to see information is clearly put out. The problem I have is matching up the figures on the wall charts with the figures in Sellafield's presentation, just one example on the Thorp chart, it shows up here 200 te at the end of the financial year, but in your presentation you talk in much bigger figures about a stretched target of 300te and go on to say after 250te of being sheared, thorp will enter an engineering outage but according to the charts your never going to get to 250 te, can you just explain the discrepancies in those figures?
77. **Todd Wright:** They are not discrepancies, it is a difference in reporting the information, there is a baseline target and then the information you are referring

to is stretched targets and there are stretched targets that we have operationally that we expect the operational plants to achieve, so you can consider it a minimum target and a maximum target to simplify that.

78. **Martin Forwood:** I'm sorry, I don't understand 250te, is that still a time at which thorp will enter an outage?

79. **Todd Wright:** I'm not sure of that.

Note from secretariat: Response sourced as follows: Thorp has a baseline target for Financial Year 2010/11 of 200 tonnes. It has already completed 242 tonnes with almost five months of the Financial Year still to run.

As mentioned at the WCSSG, the contract that we have with the NDA is incentivised to drive beyond the baseline target towards a stretched target of 300 tonnes.

The current licence instrument requires inspection of Highly Active Evaporator 'C' after each batch of 300 tonnes.

The 242 tonnes reprocessed so far during the current FY, added to 50 tonnes reprocessed last FY, takes us very close to that 300 tonnes inspection point. An engineering outage will now take place to allow that inspection of Evaporator C

80. **ITEM 5 – LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY REPORT**

81. The Chairman invited Dick Raaz to represent the LLW report.

82. Mr Raaz stated that he wished to update the committee on four items, the first being the historical completion of vault 9 construction. He commented that there had been a lot of publicity and celebration regarding that and LLW was very pleased to have vault 9 in place. He continued that he wished the committee to recognise that vault 9 is not a disposal facility but a storage facility that allows LLW repository to handle and manage waste arisings for the interim years until the disposal problems are solved. He commented that the County Council has a number of planning restrictions on how the vault may be used which are consistent with LLW repository forward plans. He re-iterated that the WCSSG should recognise vault 9 as it stands is not the be all and end all of waste management for the next several years there is still a lot of work to do to keep the vault being used properly and ensure that it allows LLWR to use vault 8 in an optimum manner. Mr Raaz commented that there is still a little bit of volume for disposal to vault 8 that LLWR is targeting for heavy disposal loads.

83. Mr Raaz moved on to talk about the environmental safety case which he reported is a critical item to enable LLWR to achieve the disposal capacity. LLWR is making good progress and intends to make the required submittal date of next May 2011. The safety case will be submitted in May 2011, it will go through a series of technical reviews and adjustment through that summer and into the fall at which time it will be submitted with a formal permit application for disposal for vault 9 and beyond.

84. Moving on, Mr Raaz reported that ACCELS is the term used for the implementation of the new national strategy which was approved by Government in August. It says that the Country and all of the waste generators are going to be expected to manage their waste in accordance with the waste hierarchy which starts with minimising the amount of waste produced, maximise the recycling and reuse of the materials that would otherwise be waste and if it is going to be waste channel it through an appropriate environmentally sustainable treatment scheme and then dispose as a last resort. Mr Raaz reported that LLWR represents an extremely valuable national resource and LLWR is doing everything it can to ensure it lasts through the gen 1 decommissioning which is expected to consume the rest of this Century. He reported that once LLWR is full, there is going to be quite a challenge to get another one.
85. The last point that Mr Raaz wanted to emphasis was stakeholder engagement, the LLWR has been looking outward quite strongly as it is a national programme, LLWR is obviously quite active in the UK but there is also a degree of interest being shown by other countries, the site has hosted the Japanese, the Koreans, the Chinese even American delegations to see how things are done. The LLWR has just sent representatives to France and about two to the IAEA all of whom watch how the UK is using its precious disposal space with an aim of all doing a much better job. He stated that there is no substitute for seeing things first hand and he offered members the opportunity to visit the LLWR site.
86. **Ron Hargreaves:** I was privileged to visit the site with the Gosforth and District Probus club, who amongst them have quite a high level of knowledge about radioactive materials and it was extremely good, very informative and I can recommend it to anybody who wants to go and have a look around and see the scale of it, it is quite staggering.
87. **Dick Raaz:** please don't hesitate to come, if you haven't seen it, you probably don't understand what we are talking about, there is nothing like seeing it.
88. **John Powe:** a comment and a question to NDA, comment would be congratulations on vault 9 the question to NDA is have they done a check to ensure that vault 9 was value for money. By that I mean has there been a check done against vault 8 to ensure that vault 8 costs plus inflation actually match vault 9. I think NDA has a responsibility to ensure the suppliers are actually giving us value for money. It arises from the same issue with evaporator D and a comparison with evaporator C, evaporator D is going to cost us £400 million pounds so the question to the NDA is do you do those sorts of comparisons.
89. **Brian Hough:** I can't answer the detailed question as to whether a financial comparison has been done as regards vault 8 and whether that has been carried out since the completion of vault 9, there are obviously detailed financial sanctioning processes that we have to go through in advance of starting any major projects so we have to examine business cases in great detail and they get financial sanctioning from Government to actually release the funds for those projects to get started and then you manage the progress of the project against that financial sanctioning background. So I imagine there are very good robust systems in place to make those judgements.

90. **Alyson Armett:** As part of the sanctioning process, as Brian said we have to go through a sanctioning process to get approval to commit the funds for any new projects and the final part of that process is to do a post investment appraisal so as a close out we would then seek to do a post investment approval which will look at all aspects of the delivery and the cost so that is an automatic thing that falls out of the process at the end of the project.
91. **John Powe:** I fully understand the sanctioning process it's a good policy I think to have belts and braces and what I am suggesting is that as a separate process to the normal sanctioning process where you look at when there has been a similar build or a similar operation you do a separate process check to compare costs, I think that is a valid belt and braces approach.
92. **Dick Raaz:** The original sanctions for vault 9 ask us to build that business case it will be reviewed, to understand if that business case stands up to what we delivered, I should also point out that OJC will be coming to review the entire contract not just vault 9 but everything to date. I don't think a firm date has been set with the NDA for that but OJC is coming it is a very high profile validation of tax payers protection against this contract it does open if you allow me to sell a little bit here Mr Chairman, Vault 8 cost a certain amount of money for a certain volume of disposal, you did not get your money's worth sir and I'm speaking to you as a tax payer because the waste management schemes in place weren't nearly sophisticated enough to withstand the scrutiny of modern waste schemes when we looked at vault 8 back in the Summer of 2006 we were energised to ensure that the UK had a much more sophisticated way to handle the waste in the 1980's there was no option but to put your waste in the box and send it to vault 8 and we did a pretty thorough analysis of what is in vault 8 and if we can get the new scheme in place vault 8 would only be half full today, so we said there has got to be a better way, so you can't just look at what did it cost me to get the cubic meter capacity that vault 8 or vault 9 represents but how you are going to use it and that's where the national strategy that just got approved comes to bear we want this site and each vault to be a significantly bigger contributor to what the country needs to get gen 1 down and so our whole focus for all of these months is to make LLWR significantly more capable than it was when it was the only choice. So yes there are a number of reviews and a number of validations that will come but don't over simplify what we are trying to do with LLWR which is to get as much of that waste going somewhere else or at least in a more cost effective way than these vaults.
93. **Chairman:** I think we have covered the hierarchy of the wastes and I think the answer was that there is an external review taking place that will look at the costings and I don't know whether that is publicly accountable or not.
94. **Dick Raaz:** Yes
95. **John Powe:** Chairman, if I may come back, I understand the waste management aspect and I appreciate that but I asked a simple question to do with the construction cost so lets not flower it up with other issues, will NDA do a comparison on what it cost engineering wise to build vault 9 compared to vault 8. How it's used I'm pleased to hear that there are strategies in place to make sure it's used in a very wise way.

96. **Brian Hough:** I'll take that comment away and we will see what we can achieve within the context of the post closure work that we do and the end of project reviews and I'm sure within that there will be an element in which we can answer those questions.
97. **Chairman:** I'm sure someone will be checking that there is value for the tax payer.
98. **Paul McKenna:** question on the LLWR relating to the historic plutonium contaminated wastes, the committee members will be aware there was a project running for a number of years to remove all of this material after it had been repackaged to the Sellafield site. Could Dick confirm whether that project was ever totally completed or is there a smaller amount of residual material that is still being looked at with a view to repackaging, was the project ever completed?
99. **Dick Raaz:** Yes, it was completed in August 2007, it was completed just before the split of the site licence to stand alone apart from Sellafield Ltd, what is happening today is we are decommissioning those magazines and the waste handling facilities that were bolted onto them, and it does produce what I would call secondary waste, the PPE and the cleanup debris that is coming out of that decommissioning. Some of it will likely be PCM and have to go back to Sellafield but all the vault waste that was stored in those facilities is long gone.
100. **Paul McKenna:** That's very useful, the reason I raised it was later this afternoon the EA report will make mention of PCM and air monitoring on the LLW site which obviously you would need adjacent to these buildings once you take them down, I just wanted to verify its not that original vault waste it's the fabric of the buildings that you are going to be taking down.
101. **Dick Raaz:** Correct.
102. **Tim Knowles:** Thanks Chair, uncharacteristically I'm going to say something very complimentary, I think the first thing to say is that everyone else might be happy with the national Low Level Waste strategy, but I for one am not in one or two significant areas, but that is not the substance of what I wanted to say. What I wanted to say was that vault 9 project in my view has been an extremely good example of the way such activities should be undertaken and it is an example of where the totality of all of the issues associated with a major project have been thought through and the dialogue with regulators at all levels was very well carried out and I think in terms of sustainable transport the way in which the dialogue continued between stakeholders of all levels and the end product has been a very good example to the point where I have asked officers in the County Council to work with LLWR to look at this as a case study of how things should be done and I'd like to complement Elaine Woodburn and Sue Brown for their role in it, I think the engagement with Government over community benefits for example was an example of how these things should be done and borough councils were particularly strongly involved in that along with county colleagues but I would compliment Dick and his team, if there is an example of how to do it I think vault 9 is that example and we will be recording that formally.

103. **Chairman:** I'm sure that everyone that got some praise there will take that willingly.
104. **Sue Brown:** I just wanted to ask Dick about the design of future vaults and how they differ from vault 9 which is obviously a new construction anyway and are we planning those as storage or disposal or are we relying on Government to tell us?
105. **Dick Raaz:** The design of vault 9 was a conservative design, what the vault needs to look like is driven very heavily by the analysis that goes into the safety case and of course vault 9 was in advance of that safety case. Analysis to date tells us a lot more about the water model that is being used to replicate the future performance of LLWR site we are now today convinced that the vault can be different not quite as resilient on the top frankly with the clays, the cap will provide the protection that we had built into the walls for vault 8 so we are anticipating the design will be somewhat simpler it will look the same and it will certainly be the same below what you see in the concrete and it will be essentially identical in the cap about but the walls will be a little bit different a little simpler and the cut off wall which you can't see at all will be quite a bit different, so yes the vault design is going to change a little bit but nothing really dramatic.
106. **Joe Clarke:** Mr Chair, I am still trying to get my head around the business case for the Low Level Waste repository that doesn't seem to want to take any waste. I mentioned it in a previous meeting that the cost of that strategy will be put back onto the projects and I think intelligent people know that the cost of reworking waste to get it from Low level down to very low level or exempt or clean is disproportionate. I think that we need to be open about the cost of decommissioning. Prevention is obviously the best way, prevention of any kind of waste, the waste we have in terms of decommissioning is already there, none of the projects that I have been involved in and certainly involved in the life time plan have anything other than working on quantities of certain levels of waste including low level waste. There is no cost and no planning there to re-work and re-work to get it down to levels where it will not need to go to the repository. Where are those costs going to come from, we have a comment, I will just refer Dick back to his comments from the April meeting in reference to the volumes of waste in the repository, Dick says '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', which is an admission that the decommissioning programme is slowing down but what we will do is put additional costs onto those projects that are left in order to re-work and re-work waste, we know that we still have a problem with VLLW that there is nowhere in the county that wants to take it so we are going to have the additional cost to meet the strategy of LLWR at Drigg in re-working the waste and then we still have a problem of getting rid of it in the end. My view is, this business is called the low level waste repository and it should be prepared to accept low level waste.
107. **Dick Raaz:** Joe the cost of the total programme is the driver, it is not the cost of LLWR. The national strategy has a number of segments that can be used to manage the waste all we are saying is, yes we will take low level waste, yes

LLWR is the right place if there is no better option. We believe strongly there are better options, we are gaining a lot of experience in metals today that's up and running and being used, combustibles and thermal treatments are just now coming on line and as you mentioned VLLW is yet to be seen. I personally believe that is the most valuable piece of the plan that is not yet in place, our position is we will take low level waste if it meets our conditions for acceptance we will take it we are obligated to take it but what we are not required to do is blindly take it if there is a better option including the cost of treatment, we recognise it would be foolish to drive the waste generators to re-fine and re-fine the mechanisms that are used to segregate waste, we don't want you to spend a fortune trying to get VLLW out one end and ILW out the other end we are not after that we are looking at the total cost. In fact there is some work going on across the estate to drive what would otherwise probably end up as ILW for deep repository disposal to get it into the LLW category where it could come to our vaults and you think the vaults are expensive you all know what the deep repository will look like in comparison, so we are just trying to maximise the value that the vaults represent, we may end up putting stuff that would look like VLLW and disposing of it into the vault if that's the best option at the time and this isn't a static question it varies from month to month and year to year, all I said in April was because the decommissioning rates aren't blowing through the roof and because some of these options are coming on line we have got a little bit of breathing room to figure it out and do it right.

108. **Joe Clarke:** Just to come back on that, we are delivering six for five on the Sellafield site and none of the plans that I've seen include working waste down to that level. The estimates are based on volumes ie: cubic metres of LLW or cubic metres of ILW and so on not on VLLW and not on re-working, so as I have said, the cost of doing that comes back to the projects, so the true cost of the tax payer is borne anyway in order to deliver the programme then the repository in my mind should be willing to accept the waste, it may well be further down the line that waste can be treated but not during or at the expense of the decommissioning programme

109. **AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY**

110. Brian Hough began the presentation and formally apologised for Ian Hudson, NDA's Sellafield Programme Director who was attending a meeting in London with Ministers, he also apologised for Dave Weatherburn, Site Programme Manager for LLWR who was on holiday. Mr Hough introduced the NDA attendees, himself, Alyson Armett, Lead Site Programme Manager at Sellafield and Phil Edge, Nuclear Safety Assurance Manager for the Sellafield site, between them they intended to present the report and answer follow up questions.

111. Mr Hough explained that the timing of the WCSSG meeting came very quickly after the end of the first six months of the financial year. NDA was very keen to report performance on those six months unfortunately the deadline for submission of reports was prior to the ending of the six month reporting period hence the slight delay in distributing the report to members. He hoped that having those performance details in the report would be useful to members.

112. Picking up on the issue that had been mentioned earlier, Mr Hough explained the latest position with regards to the life time plan. He explained that one of the first tasks given to NMP as part of the new contract was to gain a very good understanding of the site and the historic performance on the site and with that understanding deliver for the NDA a very detailed baseline plan of what those Sellafield plans would look like if you had carried on with historic performance levels. NDA has now received those plans which are being used to build what the NDA hopes will be a much better plan which will be a series of performance plans which should utilise the expertise that the competition sought from NMP and improve upon those historic levels of performance.
113. The performance plans are currently being compiled and the NDA expects to receive the prioritised performance plans for the legacy ponds and silos area of activity by the end of October; that hopefully will put NDA in a position by the back end of 2010 to talk in some detail about those intended programmes of activity. The remainder of those performance plans are due towards the turn of the calendar year which again will put NDA in the position to take stakeholders through the details of those performance plans.
114. Mr Hough reported that NDA has mentioned in the past that it wants to move away from the old very technical life time plans that were published on the NDA website and available on CD such was the extent of their content, and produce a document that reflects the kinds of information stakeholders have been asking for, ie: the key performance indicators, the milestones and the expectations of delivery. At the last WCSSG meeting the Chairman suggested that there should be some input from the WCSSG in how those plans will be put together to be presented publicly. The NDA is beginning to think through how it can involve representatives in the stakeholder community in the production of that plan. Mr Hough reported that the plan will essentially be very different to what has been seen in the past but hopefully will contain all the information that stakeholders require to make true judgements against whether NDA is actually meeting the improvements in performance and the progress that stakeholders have been asking for. Mr Hough reported that he would expect that plan to be published in that format by the end of the financial year.
115. Alyson Armett was introduced and reported that she intended to give an update for the first six months and look at some of the priorities going forward. Ms Armett continued that the NDA is set high level departmental strategic objectives by Government. The NDA has three high level departmental strategic objectives that relate to liability reduction, value for money and hazard reduction and against those targets NDA place specific targets on the site licence companies that feed up into the high level targets.
116. For Sellafield there are twelve targets that are specific to the Sellafield site licence company and they also contribute to four of NDA's estate wide targets. At this point in the financial year there are three targets that are due and Sellafield has delivered on those three targets so, year performance to date against those targets is looking good.
117. NDA also takes a view of looking forward towards the year end as some of the targets are annual targets that relate to production. Each month NDA is looking

and taking a view as to how it thinks they will out-turn at the year end. Ms Armett referred to the Evaporator D project as an example where there is one very specific target on the modules that is at risk and there are some other areas within the evaporator D project where progress is going well.

118. In terms of liabilities reduction, Ms Armett reported that the site has completed the target for the manufacture of SMP fuel assemblies for European contracts. There are four targets that are on track for delivery for year end and two at risk, one being evaporator D and the other one being the Magnox reprocessing target. The target that is at risk is a stretched target and NDA will be monitoring that closely with the SLC as the year progresses.
119. The second objective that NDA has is 'value for money' which is looking to drive a 3% cost reduction over the three years of the comprehensive spending review period from 2007. At the moment the site licence company is on target to deliver that milestone.
120. In terms of hazard reduction, Ms Armett stated that there are two targets completed to date that relate to work in the legacy ponds and silos areas and four targets that are on track for delivery for year end. There is one at risk relating to de-sludging activities in the pile fuel storage pond and one which NDA believes is unlikely to be achieved at year end which relates to vitrification targets.
121. Ms Armett continued that the site has made some good progress in the first six months of the year. The liquor activity reduction in the Magnox swarf storage silos is an important target for NDA and NDA is pleased to see that. NDA is also pleased to see work continuing relating to the integrated change programme, A new parent body organisation was brought in to drive change on the site and some changes are beginning to take place, a significant step during the first six months of the year was the completion of the projectised structure which puts resources closer to the point of delivery and gives the projects more control over those resources in order to perform. NDA will continue to keep a watching brief over those changes.
122. Looking forward to the priorities for the next six months, Ms Armett continued that there are a number of priorities, one that is important to the NDA and as Brian had talked about was getting the performance plans in place. NDA has quite a bit of work to do in that area over the next six months working together with the SLC.
123. Another important area of work for NDA is getting some of the key projects in legacy ponds and silos sanctioned through Government. NDA has to seek approval through Government for the major project spends and there are a number coming up for re-sanction in the period running up to Christmas.
124. In conclusion Ms Armett reported that NDA will continue to monitor the progress on the site against the targets and hope to see continued improvements, NDA has seen some encouraging trends and hopes to see those continue.
125. Ms Armett introduced Phil Edge who was going to talk about the safety performance on the Sellafield site.

126. Mr Edge began his report by highlighting that there has been only one nuclear safety event rated on the international nuclear event scale in the last six months at Sellafield. Over the past few years Sellafield Ltd would normally have seen five or six of those events each year. He also reported on the run of four million man hours without a lost time accident and there have also been other runs of two million man hours in the six months period that had just finished without a lost time accident.
127. In the time of the NDA being in existence, the best performance Mr Edge had seen was five million man hours and that was at a shut down Magnox station elsewhere in the country where very little work was being performed, so Mr Edge thought this performance at Sellafield was really excellent and signified a significant improvement within the last six months. This was the transformation NDA had hoped to achieve by bringing NMP in to take over Sellafield Ltd.
128. Mr Edge went on to report that it didn't mean that everything is perfect, the event in the HALES plant in January, some recent events in the Magnox swarf storage silos that were mentioned in the Sellafield report and the event where the waste bags were sent to Lillyhall have all provided opportunities for learning, and the clearest lesson in those is the importance of the basics of disciplined professional operations which Sellafield Ltd is addressing.
129. A significant safety and environmental issue is the legacy ponds and silos plants at Sellafield and it had already been mentioned that some real hazard and risk reduction activities are now starting to be completed.
130. Mr Hough concluded the NDA report by reporting on socio economic impacts of current and potential future job losses, he updated the group as to where NDA is up to with regards to studies into those impacts. NDA has commissioned through Sellafield Ltd a very short socio economic impact study on the potential effect of job losses this financial year and are working with the County Council Officers on that at the moment and expect the results of that to be available by the end of October 2010. NDA will feed that back through ordinary communication vehicles, and will ensure that report is posted onto the WCSSG website.
131. On the much broader socio economic impact study, Mr Hough reminded members that it has been discussed in the past about the previous ERM study into the impacts of decommissioning on the local economy and the desire to refresh that study. He continued that it was also driven by the availability of the new workforce profile that will come out of the new Sellafield plan and it has been to everyone's frustration that while that work is awaited it has been difficult to get that work underway, however NDA is now funding a programme of activity through the Energy Coast where that study is getting underway. All the modelling will start on that soon it will be using indicative work along with data that exists among many partners, so it is a multi agency approach to that study. NDA expected that detailed socio economic impact study to be completed at the end of the financial year as that final Sellafield plan is available so NDA can immediately answer for the local community the impacts of that plan on the economy and that study will also build in potential for other scenarios as regards future developments that are being driven through the Energy Coast initiative.

132. Mr Hough wished to encourage everyone to attend the 26th October meeting focusing on NDA strategy II. Mr Hough reported that NDA has done a considerable amount of work with individual stakeholder organisations on the process of the strategy. Mr Hough reported that there will be a number of NDA representatives on the day, which will be run as more of a workshop session so that stakeholders could spend time getting to understand the issues that are of interest to them, to enable them to make an informed response to the strategy II consultation. Tony Fountain was also attending the meeting, and Mr Hough hoped he would be in a position to give some indication of what NDA's early thoughts were following the announcement of the CSR settlement on 20th October, and the impact of that settlement on work going forward over the next three to four years.
133. **Tim Knowles:** I think I have to say to Brian, yes we are doing this work jointly with you, the County council are looking at future economic impacts and employment etc, but I think I have to go back and this isn't a criticism of you Brian or your current colleagues you say under Sellafield plan development, the inherited Sellafield plan had not been endorsed by the NDA and was not considered to be either robust or deliverable, the fact is that since 2005 we have not had any credible manpower numbers or projections from the NDA and that has made the job of the local authorities both the County Council and the district councils extremely hard. Bearing in mind of course that Sellafield is more than 50% of the economy of Copeland, the lack of our ability to plan and to project forward what the impacts of changes at Sellafield are going to be has been extremely unhelpful, I'm hopeful that under the new regime and I know you Brian personally are very committed to address these issues, but it has been very unsatisfactory and it has really hampered our ability as local authorities to protect what is our job the wellbeing of the people of West Cumbria.
134. Turning to specifics under LLWR Ltd, the second to last paragraph – 'good work continues in stimulating the supply chain' – well that is one way of putting it I suppose and you say the next stages are targeting incineration and VLLW services, well I think you know very well and certainly the local authorities take a view that stimulating the supply chain in relation to very low level waste has resulted in private sector initiatives to fill landfill holes in West Cumbria with hundreds of thousands of tonnes of very low level waste tracked from the Sellafield site across our roads in a pretty unsustainable way and frankly going against most of the tenets of waste disposal that we are having to work with in all other areas of waste activities. The imposition of this sort of facility against the wishes of the local authorities and the local communities will be very unhelpful indeed and could well impact on public acceptability of other categories of waste where there are very sensitive discussions and voluntaries approaches being taken at the moment and I have to say to you that none of this is helped by the fact that and I think it was Mr Fountain himself that indicated at the national stakeholder group that there are apparently 57,000 bags of contaminated asbestos on the way from Chapelcross to Lillyhall at some time in the not too distant future now I may have misunderstood what he said, but I don't think that is going to go down very well so I think we have got a lot of work to do in terms of the engagement between the local authorities on the major economic planning issues and also on waste issues and I think hiding behind a national waste strategy

where nobody understood that these were likely to be the outcomes is not going to be the way forward, so I look forward to a lot of very strong and comprehensive bilateral discussions on these issues in future.

135. **Brian Hough:** Just to reassure Tim that we are extremely aware of his continuing concerns and I personally over the last 24 hours have taken on board those comments and are ensuring that we can continue those discussions at a very senior level within the NDA.
136. **Joe Clarke:** Just with reference to NDA strategy II, just over a couple of years ago like many people in West Cumbria, I was greatly enthused by the NMP talk of skyline change. My question is quite simple, given that NDA strategy II states that their strategy is to saturate high hazard projects and that strategy is being parroted by NMP, then who is the controlling mind for Sellafield?
137. **Phil Edge:** Clearly the organisation in charge of day to day safety on the site is Sellafield Ltd, they are the holders of the site licence and they have the responsibility and the authority to manage the site in the way that they see fit. NDA can provide strategic direction but they choose the way in which activities are carried out on the site. Now we would like to progress broad front decommissioning its become abundantly clear to us that the highest priority on the site and really it is a national priority is to clean up the high risk, high hazard legacy facilities, so it really is imperative that is where we place the priority.
138. **Ron Hargreaves:** This was a significant part of the discussion at the last Decommissioning sub committee meeting and we were given some extremely valuable information by the site on a quantitative assessment of hazards and where they sit in relation to each other. This demonstrated quite clearly how the site seem to be really concentrating on where the very high hazards are and when you look at the graph and you see it is a logarithmic scale you can see where one stands out and work is clearly being concentrated on that but presumably you couldn't concentrate everybody on that because they wouldn't fit in the building. There are other things as well. I was really quite struck by the discussion that went on at that meeting unfortunately there weren't that many people there but nevertheless the people that were there got the benefit of some interesting and useful contributions to understanding what is actually behind the decisions that are being made.
139. **Martin Forwood:** Brian mentioned the baseline plans having been accepted by the NDA, does that mean they are now in the public domain, when can we first see them.
140. **Brian Hough:** They aren't in the public domain at this moment in time, there is an intention to bring those into the public domain, I think I explained at the time there are still elements of those that we are working on and using those to begin to build the performance plans, the actual document that I talked about we intend to explain that whole process and how we will move from the assumptions in the baseline plan to what we expect the actual delivery to be. So I can give the assurances that there will be baseline details included in those published plans yes so you can compare the difference between what the baseline would have been and the performance that we expect.

141. **Martin Forward:** Your reference to the life time plan itself being available what at the end of the financial year. Is that going to be what you describe as the new version of the life time plan.
142. **Brian Hough:** It will be in fact the whole approach in developing the life time plan for Sellafield post the introduction of NMP is a slightly different approach to the way life time plans were developed prior to that competition and in the very early days of the NDA. So it's a bit difficult at this stage to say that we will have a plan that will be comparable to how the plan was structured back in 2005 for instance, as I did mention what we intend within the introduction to that plan is actually show the journey by which we've moved from one kind of plan to another so that there is an ability for you to actually see how we've now moved through a different kind of plan and the detail about those performance plans is that they will be very much front end loaded if you like in detail to tie them into the contract review dates of the NMP contract. So again we hope to actually pick up those comments early about how you can judge the effectiveness of the new owner of Sellafield Ltd and their performance.
143. **Martin Forwood:** Chairman, if I could just put in a plea to the NDA, I sincerely hope that this new design LTP is not going to be a dumbed down version of what we've had in the past which have always been pretty useful and I'm afraid dumbing down of NDA documents seems to be pretty rife at the moment, there is a desperate lack of hard facts in them, there is a lot of wish wash even I could have written some of their reports for them. I just hope that this LTP is not going to be a dumbed down version.
144. **Martin Forwood:** Could I just make one final point about their presentation today, I just wondered, they say that the operational plants had a successful year during 2009/10, the official documents show that all the major operating plants underperformed, some of them missing their targets by a mile, I just wondered how you can substantiate saying it was a successful operational year?
145. **Alyson Armett:** The targets that we set for the site last year, there was 44 targets set against the departmental strategic objectives last year and the site achieved 41 of those targets. One of those targets that was missed related to Magnox reprocessing and the other two related to the legacy ponds and silos projects so it was on the basis of achievements of those targets, so with respect to the operating plants with the exception of Magnox they did hit the targets that we had tagged against the departmental strategic objectives.
146. **Martin Forwood:** I don't know where you get your targets from because they didn't tally with Sellafield's targets and the targets that were in the public domain were all missed. I've got the figures here if you want them.
147. **Alyson Armett:** I think we need to take this off line and look at that, because for the targets that we have, 41 of the 44 were achieved for 2009/10.
148. **Chairman:** If you can discuss that outside and clarify it for Martin.
149. **AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM STUDSVIK**

150. Paul Fryer offered Mike McMullen's apologies.
151. Mr Fryer began his report by stating that it had been just over 12 months since Studsvik received its nuclear site licence and during that year had processed various items of metal, some of them had been challenges, some had been big tanks, some had been in iso containers, but Studsvik had managed to process the equivalent to almost 500 metres cubed of metal and recovered it. From that point of view, Mr Fryer felt Studsvik offered a viable option for the recovery of LLW in the form of contaminated metal.
152. Mr Fryer continued that Health and safety and Environmental performance had been good, Studsvik had no lost time accidents, three minor first aid injuries, all relating to cuts on hands. As with any nuclear licensed site Studsvik had to demonstrate compliance to the regulators and had successfully carried out its level one demonstration in June this year. Studsvik is subject to regular audits by the NII and the other regulators, the EA and OCNS.
153. In terms of community engagement and support, Mr Fryer reported that Studsvik had renewed its sponsorship of Workington Cricket club and had an initiative through the year where it engaged with some local schools. Studsvik had also hosted several visits from the local schools to the MRF in order to show them the facility.
154. In conclusion Mr Fryer reported Studsvik currently employs 13 people at Lillyhall, there have been two positions filled since the last meeting Mr Fryer attended, one was for a health physics monitor and the other was for a site assurance manager. Studsvik has interviewed several other candidates and has created a pool of candidates, for the purposes of business improving. Currently the amount of metal going into the facility is a little unreliable but once the business settles down and the metal is going through the facility then there is an opportunity to recruit more people for operations.

155. ITEM 8 – NII REPORT

156. Dr Tait began his presentation by explaining that NII has changed its reporting procedures so that members can now receive reports two weeks before the meetings.
157. He intended to highlight some of the key areas in the report and give an update of what has happened since the end of the reporting period. He would also be pleased to take any comments on the report or any other matters.
158. In terms of 'Transforming our business', as Dr Tait had reported on in the past, the previous Government proposed to establish a separate office for Nuclear Regulation to replace the Nuclear Directorate. This proposal is still with Ministers for consideration.
159. Moving on to talk about Legacy Silos Projects, and firstly the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo. Dr Tait reported that the active commissioning of the Liquor Activity Reduction project began, and a number of successful batch transfers have now been completed. Transfers were temporarily stopped twice by SL

following two events that Dr Tait would cover later. Transfers continued after SL had investigated the events, and had satisfied itself that sufficient control measures were in place to allow the transfers to continue safely.

160. Secondly, Dr Tait updated the committee that the Pile Fuel Clad Storage Silo where the active commissioning of the new argon passive off-system began.
161. Moving onto the Legacy Ponds Projects, firstly the First Generation Magnox Storage Pond, Dr Tait reported that SL has now achieved full availability of the emergency pumping system.
162. Unfortunately the Intermediate Level Waste Specification associated with the pond was not met. A meeting was held to discuss this, and SL is providing a response to issues NII raised.
163. Dr Tait also reported that in terms of the Pile Fuel Storage Pond, five out of six short term milestones were successfully completed.
164. Moving onto Decommissioning zones 2 and 3, Dr Tait informed the committee that SL met a significant regulatory requirement by complying with a Specification associated with the Medium Active Solid Waste Storage Cells.
165. He reported that at Windscale, several projects are being deferred and NII has written requesting justifications for the deferrals, and in particular Pile 1 decommissioning. NII is in discussions with SL on this matter.
166. Moving onto Calder Hall, NII witnessed an emergency exercise last week which was satisfactory. This was a prerequisite to the start of active commissioning of the fuel route. The fuel route will be needed for the de-fuelling of the reactors.
167. Dr Tait informed the committee that in terms of Lifecycle Baseline, NII is still concerned about certain programme delays and is looking for acceleration via the Integrated Change Programme.
168. NII is also continuing discussions with SL on the need to ensure continued nuclear safety when there are deferrals.
169. NII has continued to engage with SL on the development of improved arrangements for decommissioning.
170. With regards to the Voluntary Severance Programme, Dr Tait reported that in August NII received the management of change submissions setting out the staff reductions proposed as part of the programme. These were assessed and NII was satisfied that SL could proceed. NII wrote to SL to this effect and also provided some advice.
171. Dr Tait reported that with regards to the Integrated Change Programme, NII is still concerned about the lack of robust underpinning to demonstrate how the associated improvements will be delivered. The position is still being discussed with SL.

172. Moving onto the merger of Emergency Plans for the Windscale and Sellafield sites, following on from the satisfactory emergency exercise in March, NII has now approved the combined emergency arrangements.
173. Dr Tait reported that there was a Level 1 demonstration emergency exercise in May and NII judged that this was an adequate demonstration of SL's emergency arrangements.
174. Moving onto coordinated site wide inspections, earlier this year NII introduced a Sellafield policy on licence compliance inspection. This requires the undertaking of quarterly coordinated site wide inspections by all the site inspectors. These inspections focus on key or "cornerstone" licence conditions ie: those that NII believe are most relevant to the site.
175. During April to June NII covered LC 11 – Emergency Arrangements and found that practices vary across the site and there is a lack of nuclear control in certain areas. NII is presently discussing the way forward with SL.
176. NII held a joint inspection with EA on Low Level Waste and during the inspection there were many examples of good practice.
177. Moving onto the annual review of safety, Dr Tait reported that this was rather disappointing and NII is working with SL to improve the position.
178. NII undertook a conventional safety inspection associated with lifting regulations, the inspection revealed that many improvements have been made since the serious lifting accident in 2008, but SL recognise there is still some way to go.
179. Dr Tait reported that the improvements being undertaken by SL on Thorp are on track to meet the notice NII issued in 2008.
180. Moving onto non routine matters, firstly the disruption of cooling water supplies that took place in HALES during January this year, the first Improvement Notice NII issued, which requires improvements to the training of Nominated Persons, has now been cleared.
181. NII issued a second Improvement Notice. This requires the explicit consideration of nuclear safety within the risk assessments associated with safe systems of work. SL is introducing improvements to address this notice.
182. Dr Tait reported that NII's enforcement work is continuing and he believed formal statements were being taken today – (07.10.10)
183. In conclusion Dr Tait reported that with regards to the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo, SL temporarily stopped the Liquor Activity Reduction transfers following the events. Letters of concern regarding the events have been sent to SL and NII's enforcement work is ongoing.
184. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Dr Tait for the work he had undertaken with regards to changing working practices to enable NII reports to be available two weeks before the meetings. The Chairman noted his appreciation for that work and also noted the user friendly report.

185. ITEM 9 - REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

186. Mr Allott presented the report and explained that Andy Mayall who is the permanent member of the team was on secondment at the moment and Mr Allott was on assignment for a 12 month period.
187. Mr Allott intended to update members on a couple of items from the report and any additional information that had come to light since the distribution of the report.
188. Mr Allott reported an amendment to figure 1 in the report which was showing information slightly incorrect, the reported had been altered and placed on the WCSSG website.
189. In his report, he referred to an issue relating to Uranium Trioxide powder in the ventilation duct and in the report it stated that there was no indication of an elevated aerial release. Since writing the report EA has some indications that there may have been an elevated release and that is still under investigation at the moment.
190. Mr Allott mentioned the incident involving the disposal of suspect Low Level waste packages to the Lillyhall landfill in April 2010. That is currently being investigated by the EA and by the department for transport and by the NII and that work or investigation is still ongoing at the moment.
191. Mr Allott went on to report that the European Commission had visited the Sellafield site in August. They visited to look at monitoring arrangements at the site under the Euratom treaty and specifically under article 35 of that treaty. The inspectors came for a four day period in August they had previously been in 2004 to look at monitoring arrangements both discharge monitoring and environmental monitoring. They looked at on-site environmental monitoring and around various plants on site, EARP and THORP and at the end of the visit they were both able to close out the majority of their recommendations from the previous visit in 2004 and give only one recommendation going forward which related to the method used by the Sellafield site to account for non-stack discharges from the site (discharges from open ponds etc.) High volume air samplers are used to account for that release. Mr Allott reported that overall it was a pretty successful visit and inspectors did conclude that they believed Sellafield was in compliance with the Euratom article 35.
192. Mr Allot reported on an issue EA has relating to the combined import/export facility and the design of that facility which will be used for the transfer of higher activity waste from temporary storage. The design looks as though part of the plant or part of the facility will be within the water table and that is contrary to EA's own guidance for these sorts of facilities. EA is currently discussing this issue with Sellafield Ltd.
193. Mr Allott reminded members of the discovery last year of a leak of condensate from a condensate drain that drains from the ventilation duct on the Sellafield site and that this condensate was leaking to ground. That was subject to an enforcement notice from the EA. Earlier this Summer EA concluded that for the

majority of the enforcement actions they had been dealt with satisfactory but there were two items that hadn't been dealt with satisfactory, they were fairly minor items in terms of dates missed and the work in one case had been completed and in another case is well underway, so EA took the view that it would issue a warning notice to Sellafield Ltd for formal failure to complete an enforcement notice, but given the enormous effort and the amount of work that had been completed to investigate the matter and to deal with any other problems on the site then EA felt that was an appropriate response in that case.

194. In terms of the actual event itself and the investigation into that and the consequences into that, Mr Allott reported that EA has completed its investigation and currently the decision on what enforcement action is taken is with EA Management at the moment.
195. Mr Allott re-iterated Dr Tait's concerns with regards to the Nuclear Safety events at the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo. EA take an interest in it and recognise that NII has the lead to deal with that matter.
196. Mr Allott went on to talk about beach monitoring, The committee are all well aware of the ongoing programme of looking at beach monitoring at particles on the Sellafield beaches and the beaches in West Cumbria. There is new equipment being deployed which has a much higher sensitivity to alpha particles and certainly more alpha particles have been found over recent months as a result of using that more sensitive equipment. COMARE, (Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation and Radioactivity in the Environment) is looking at the results of that monitoring and what the implications are of finding those higher alpha particles. However the Health Protection Agency has reviewed its advice and are quite satisfied that current advice stands and there is no risk to members of the public.
197. Moving onto the Low Level Waste repository, Mr Allott updated the committee that EA has received a variation from LLWR to enable LLWR to send waste from other facilities to the Sellafield site for example for metals recycling treatment but also to other facilities in England and Wales for the treatment of waste.
198. EA is preparing for the review of the Environmental Safety Case which will end in May of next year. Mr Allott concluded by stressing it is very important that EA delivers an assessment of that Environmental safety case in a timely manner to ensure onward operation.
199. **Paul McKenna:** Section 4.1 on page 7, the annual review of safety. The LLWR there is a mention of these minor events with equipment pump failure, filter sample card blow out, I would understand this to be an air monitoring equipment that you have on the site that would be used when Mr Raaz knocks down his old magazines from the 1950's. Casting my mind way back to previous meetings of this committee there was concern a number of years ago about maintenance of this air monitoring equipment on the facility near Drigg. That is something that you obviously audit on a regular basis to ensure this air monitoring equipment is fully functional and fit for purpose when these operations are under way.

200. **Rob Allott:** Absolutely, yes part of our inspection is to look at the maintenance regime for air monitoring equipment and that is part of that inspection. If you want any more information, I am happy to provide that to you on any recent investigations on that.
201. **Paul McKenna:** No, that's fine it was just to clarify that it was indeed the air monitoring equipment on site, thank you.
202. **Ron Hargreaves:** I think it is a very simple question actually, I think I know the answer but I'm not certain. On figure 2 it's in the paragraph, discharges to air, but figure 2 is actually entitled gaseous discharges, most of the items on the graph are not gases as far as I am aware. Is it just a matter of error?
203. **Rob Allott:** Yes I'm afraid it is, it is airborne discharges.
204. **Martin Forwood:** Rob on page 4 paragraph 2.6, you talk about Studsvik and you refer to Studsvik intention to seek a variation to their authorisation to allow the transfer of some waste residues back to the originating sites. Could you just expand on that. I understood that the return shipments from Lillyhall were all part and parcel of the original planning application. Or is this something new, a new departure or new transports, more transports.
205. **Rob Allot:** I'm afraid I haven't got the information on that, my colleague from Studsvik may be able to answer that if not I'm happy to bring an answer back for you.
206. **Paul Fryer:** Martin, I'm not in a position to answer that either.
207. **Chairman:** As usual we will get the information back to you and share it with other members.
208. **Note from secretariat: response sourced following the meeting from Rob Allott as follows:**
209. During a recent periodic review of Studsvik's permit for the Metals Recycling Facility (MRF) the operators highlighted an intent to seek a variation to their permit to allow the transfer of certain waste residues back to the original consigning site. Studsvik has at this time not yet applied for this variation and so we do not have full details of the scope or intent.
210. At present any operator may seek a permit to transfer waste to the MRF for treatment of waste. Once treated the operator of the MRF is generally left with significantly reduced volumes of radioactive residues (although with concentrated radioactivity), clean metal that can go into the open market and also sometimes miscellaneous radioactive waste such as materials used for packaging or that could not be treated. At present the permit only allows for disposal of these residues and other wastes via LLWR at Drigg or a VLLW where appropriate. These routes will not necessarily always be the most appropriate disposal route, if for example alternative disposal facilities are available, or further treatment of the waste can be undertaken in accordance with the waste

management hierarchy. It is our understanding that Studsvik wish to take advantage of such opportunities for better waste management where appropriate.

211. Our understanding is that return shipments were part of the original planning application. These wastes and residues are nothing new and result from wastes that were already permitted for treatment. There should be no additional transport of waste undertaken, although the wastes may go to different sites for disposal or further treatment. In any case Studsvik will need to make a BAT case for any transfers of waste, demonstrating that it represents the best available option taking all factors into consideration. We will consider the expected application further once received and will not make a decision until we have all the relevant information available to us.

212. **Martin Forwood:** Thanks Chairman, just a second point on page 8, this combined import/export facility that Rob mentioned and its relationship to it being in the water table. Can you explain that a bit more, how does the plant manage to be in a water table?

213. **Rob Allot:** This is the design of the plant, so the design means that part of it would be basically under the water table, so actually will be in the saturated zone.

214. **Martin Forwood:** So are we talking about the foundations.

215. **Rob Allott:** We are talking about design, I believe it is the tunnel part of the import/export facility, but maybe someone has better information.

216. **ITEM 10 – SUMMARY REPORTS FROM THE SUB COMMITTEES**

217. **DECOMMISSIONING SUB COMMITTEE**

218. Ron Hargreaves reported that the Analysis of High Hazard and Risk Reduction (HHRR), presented at the May meeting was further discussed at the September meeting and is an important factor, (but not the only one), in informing selection and prioritisation of the Site Decommissioning work programme. Discussion of this topic will remain an important part of the committee's business in future meetings.

219. The committee noted that based on this topic and taking other factors into account, was the intention not to finish the decommissioning of the Windscale Piles and to hold them in abeyance. Members were keen to ensure that there would be proper archiving of all the knowledge obtained to date so that it would be unnecessary to start again and rediscover things that had already been done.

220. The committee were under the impression that the life time plan had been delivered by the NDA and was pleased that it has, Members looked forward to seeing it.

221. **SOCIO ECONOMIC SUB COMMITTEE**

222. Ms Woodburn reported that the socio economic sub committee felt it had been unable to deliver its remit as it was coming up against obstacles on a regular basis.

223. She reported that information was being received from the Sellafield Site on its plans and the committee has been receiving information from the NDA and Britain's Energy Coast. Where she felt the system had fallen down was Sellafield's inability to monitor the socio economic responsibility of the contractors on site. She recognised Sellafield Ltd had taken a step forward by ensuring that socio economics aspects are included in the contracts given out, but the committee cannot seem to get the information relating to whether they are actually being delivered.
224. In order to move the situation on, Ms Woodburn asked for agreement from the Site Stakeholder Group to request a presentation for the next full site stakeholder group meeting from Sellafield to help explain how Sellafield Ltd is going to monitor the socio economic responsibilities that the contractors have.
225. Ms Woodburn stressed it was something that she did not particularly want to do but as there did not seem to be much success through the socio economic sub committee then she felt this was the only option.
226. **Joe Clarke:** Just in support of what Elaine has been saying. What we have from Sellafield Ltd is a number of aspirational statements rather than any fact that we can get our teeth into. As recently as this morning for instance there was a debate on Radio 4 about protectionism, we appreciate the constraints that Sellafield has to work within, but nonetheless we think there is much more that could be done and we are here to help in that process.
227. **Chairman:** There was a clear indication from Elaine there that she would like a presentation to the next meeting, we do have a meeting on Thursday 6th January 2011 in Cleator Moor Civic Hall, I think it will be quite appropriate for Sellafield Ltd to give us a presentation on their socio economic plan and how they are going to monitor and carry that forward. There are opportunities within that agenda on that day. So I think if the committee is in agreement it will be appropriate

228. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE

229. Professor Haywood wished to highlight from his report the fact that there was a prediction that there would be a fresh risk assessment from the Health Protection Agency in the Autumn.
230. **Paul McKenna:** Dr McKenna referred to the last sentence in the report regarding the Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment. It was really just to bring to the attention of this committee that there is speculation that this committee would be possibly disbanded or stood down in the near future. I don't know whether the Professor would have access to any up to date information and perhaps indeed there hasn't been a definitive or official statement from UK Government. Any views or comments he has on it would be useful.
231. **Professor Haywood:** I'm not an expert on this but I believe the situation is that COMARE appears on a very long list of such organisations which are subject to review as to their usefulness and I know no more than that.

232.LOW LEVEL WASTE SUB COMMITTEE:

233.Cllr Brown reported that prior to the LLW sub committee report which is April to September an issue had arisen from a member of the public about the state of the road through Drigg and Holmrook. Considering its usage and the amount of vehicles that pass along that road, there were concerns from local people about the maintenance of it and about the annual inspection. Cllr Brown stated that despite the fact that she has spoken to the area engineer verbally nothing has ever been received in writing, however she confirmed that a formal letter now has gone to the highways engineer to hopefully reassure us that annual inspections do take place and if not why not.

234.COMMERCIAL SUB COMMITTEE

235.Cllr Davidson thanked Ali McKibbin for her support as Secretariat to the sub committee and wished her well in her new appointment. He also welcomed Karl Connor who is taking over as Secretary to the group.

236.He reported that the committee has had comments that previous minutes were not quite as full and comprehensive as desirable, this is being addressed and it has been agreed that all future meetings will use the recording system being used today.

237.At the last sub committee meeting a statement was made by the NDA that commercial income was in decline and expenditure in new facilities in forthcoming years would make funding an issue. There is concern over that and how this is reflected in the draft NDA strategy, we welcomed the announcement of the meeting later in the month when further enquiries can be made on the draft strategy plan of the NDA.

238.**Chairman:** Just a comment on the recording of sub committee meetings. It won't be this system that were using here today we are getting a smaller unit to use for the sub committees because there has at several sub committees been sometimes challenges to what people have said or thought they have said, it is not that we are going to produce minutes verbatim its just for clearing up occasional queries when people think they have said something that they didn't and vice versa. So it isn't the elaborate system that we have here today, it is just a smaller device that we have for the sub committees.

239.EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

240.The Chairman explained that OSCAR 9.5 is an exercise that has been set up to look at recovery which he thought was a very important area that sometimes gets overlooked in emergency planning. The trend is to deal with what would happen in an incident and the immediate aftermath, this exercise is looking at moving in around five days into an event that has taken place and looking at the recovery. He thought it would be challenging for local authorities and organisations that take control in the incidents.

241.The Chairman went on to report that the site sirens are working well.

242. The Chairman explained that one of the areas the Emergency Planning sub committee is looking at is security. The Committee feel it is a key issue and is looking to capture in the new terms of reference that it recognises that there may be times when discussing security sensitive information that that part of the meeting will not be open to members of the public and the press.

243. Moving on the Chairman reported that the sub committee is looking forward to receiving statements from the NDA on the protocols for the insurance after incidents. It has raised some concern in discussions which prompted this request for clarity.

244. The Chairman made members aware that there was a planned exercise on Tuesday 12th October at the Sellafield site between 7pm and 9pm which will involve a large amount of emergency vehicles moving towards the Sellafield site.

245. **Tim Knowles:** Thank you for the detail Chairman if I can say, I think these notes (Emergency Planning) of the meeting take brevity to the point of ridiculousness if we could have slightly more content on paper in future it would be very welcome.

246. **ITEM 11 – DATE AND VENUES OF NEXT MEETINGS**

247. The Chairman concluded the meeting and told members that the special meeting of WCSSG is being held on 26th October to discuss the NDA Strategy II document – 1300 – 1600hrs at Cleator Moor Civic Hall. The next event of the WCSSG will be Thursday 6th January 2011 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall and the next scrutiny meeting will be Thursday 7th April 2011 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall.