

**MINUTES OF THE 12th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT CLEATOR MOOR CIVIC AND MASONIC CENTRE
ON THURSDAY 7TH APRIL 2011**

Present:

Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Cllr T Knowles	-	Cumbria County Council
Lindsay Gray	-	Churches Forum
Mr P Clements	-	Prospect
Mr Ranald Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Mr R Hargreaves	-	Community representative
Prof J Haywood	-	Chairman, Environmental Health sub committee
Dr Rob Allott	-	Environment Agency
Dr I Tait	-	Office for Nuclear Regulation, (ONR)
Mr R Raaz	-	Low Level Waste Repository Ltd
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Mrs R Robinson	-	WCSSG Secretariat
Mr Phil Hallington	-	Sellafield Limited
Mr I Irving	-	Sellafield Limited
Mr M McMullen	-	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
Mrs J O'Reilly	-	Copeland Borough council
Peter Connelly	-	Copeland Borough Council
Norman Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Stewart Kemp	-	Cumbria County 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.
3. The Chairman started proceedings by expressing sympathy for colleagues in Japan, who since the last meeting had suffered the most horrendous disaster and who are currently still working tirelessly to recover the situation over there. A further update would be given during Iain Irving's presentation in terms of the practical activities that have been ongoing with the industry here.

4. The Chairman went on to explain that several representatives who were giving reports had to leave early as there was a very important Norwegian visit to the Sellafield site and they were committed to attend the visit.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

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

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

There were no amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 7th October 2010.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – NDA REPORT – DR IAN HUDSON

6. Dr Hudson re-iterated the Chairman and stated that in respect of colleagues in Japan, his thoughts and the thoughts of the NDA go out to them. A lot of time is spent in the industry exercising emergency responses and ensuring the right kind of safety systems. Thinking about Japanese colleagues who have had to go through the process of implementing them and working with them it is very instrumental in the way we look at these things which is really important.
7. Dr Hudson reported that from the Japan perspective, NDA has taken on board, the way the industry should focus on how it approaches the outcome of what has happened in Japan and the NDA is really pleased with the way that Chris Hulme has approached it in terms of an independent enquiry through the NII. Any potential lessons in the short and long term need to be incorporated into future operations in an open and transparent way.
8. NDA has been working with the SLC's across the estate to ensure that in the short term if there are any immediate issues to address with respect to Japan, they would do. NDA asked all its SLC's to address a series of questions which looked at issues ranging from operational seismic response through to emergency response and NDA is confident that a reasonable process is in place and there is no immediate requirement to stop any of the operations that are ongoing.
9. He continued that NDA had a request from colleagues in Japan for supplies that would help them in their operations. Sellafield Ltd co-ordinated an extensive response across the estate from Magnox and Dounreay of a number of supplies. NDA is really pleased with the efforts that Sellafield Ltd put into co-ordinating that response to send out equipment to help the Japanese response. He stated that as the independent review goes forward through Mike Weightman, NDA and its sites would participate in and respond to any particular recommendations.
10. Moving to concentrate on the NDA report, Dr Hudson reported that NDA finally received approval for its strategy by the Secretary of State. The extent of consultation and participation in terms of content to the strategy was very extensive, not just across the UK but particularly around West Cumbria. The

WCSSG participated in a number of special events and contributed quite significantly for which Dr Hudson expressed his thanks and those of the NDA.

11. In terms of the spending review process, Dr Hudson stated that at the last meeting it was reported that the NDA was participating in working with Government to show them the range of options that they had in respect of spending. The NDA had a good response working with Government resulting in Sellafield's funding for next year being around £1.55 billion, which is slightly up on last year and the commitment over the next four years is approximately flat with increments for inflation which, given the financial circumstances that the Country finds itself in it shows significant commitment to the mission at Sellafield.
12. Dr Hudson reported that the Government was particularly struck by the focus on hazard reduction, dealing with the legacy ponds and silos and was really keen with getting on and completing the missions around reprocessing at Magnox and Thorp. Dr Hudson felt it was a good settlement for Sellafield, however, built into that, given the amount of work that has to be done in the next four years at Sellafield, with the construction of plants to treat some of the waste retrieval it is a significant amount of work to do, so there has to be a continued focus in terms of efficiency and effectiveness on site, that is absolutely key in terms of going forward.
13. Dr Hudson referred to the financial year end with respect to Sellafield, NDA is very busy ensuring that it understands how well the targets set for the year have been met, the extent to which they have been successful and also mapping out the key themes for next year. In terms of closing out the year, NDA uses a programme based on base targets and stretched targets. Overall the site has improved its performance from last year to this year as demonstrated by the number of targets achieved, and increases in terms of plant throughput, an example being Thorp which achieved 217 tonnes reprocessed the year before, this year they have achieved in excess of 350 tonnes, so some improvements can be seen in the operating plants.
14. In the legacy ponds and silos area, NDA is really pleased with the transfer of some of the liquor from one of the buildings there and the sludge moved into much better storage containment in that building, highlighting some really good progress.
15. In terms of safety, mapping the industrial and the nuclear statistics, all the indicators look better than last year also, so safety and environmental performance has again improved from last year to this year.
16. NDA has been a little disappointed in the throughputs on Magnox reprocessing and Vitrification, but are assured, working with Sellafield, that there is some good improvement plans around those areas suggesting a good year for next year.
17. In terms of priorities for next year at Sellafield, Dr Hudson reported that the focus is the legacy facilities and delivering the performance plan.
18. In the area of operations, the focus will be continued improvement in reprocessing and a real focus on Vitrification and HAL.

19. Dr Hudson went on to report that Sellafield Ltd is really driving quite a considerable culture change programme in the way that it operates. He stated that there was going to be a real focus on driving that culture change, winning the hearts and minds of the workforce to ensure improvements and effectiveness and efficiency going forward.
20. He anticipated that having received the performance plan, one of the things he has been really keen to do and reasonably frustrated that it hadn't been managed is to ensure very visible targets published through the WCSSG, so the group can get a sense of progress and hold both NDA and the site accountable to that progress. Dr Hudson hoped the performance plan would give a good basis for that.
21. Concluding his report, Dr Hudson reported that the NDA finished its restructuring with the sites teams now a lot more integrated into the NDA, as part of that restructuring Dr Hudson introduced Mark Steele who had joined the team operating as his deputy. Mark brings a good sense of expertise in project management and delivering quite large projects in the nuclear industry and will strengthen the team in terms of how it looks at some of the project work at Sellafield.
22. **AGENDA ITEM 4 – REPORT FROM SELLAFIELD LTD – IAIN IRVING**
23. Mr Irving explained that the visit to Sellafield site which was requiring the presence of several members of the WCSSG was by Mr Solheim, the Environment Minister from Norway. He continued that over many years, Sellafield has had a very open and very productive dialogue with Norway. Norway have had issues in terms of discharges, added to that there was the NRPA reports recently published, but nonetheless, some very productive relationships. Mr Irving also informed the committee that there is a small delegation out in Norway the week following this meeting to speak to stakeholders out there on a broader basis.
24. Moving to report on Sellafield Ltd progress, Mr Irving stated that overall it has been a very successful year, he had placed a number of posters on the walls that he hoped members would get the chance to view which contained some information on the year end results. The charts highlighted that safety statistics have been good this year, with less conventional accidents, less INES events and less environmental non compliances in the last year culminating in the best year certainly out of the last four.
25. Mr Irving clarified that the charts stated the year end position, which was an update from what appeared in the Sellafield Ltd report, given that the report was issued some weeks earlier.
26. Still on the subject of safety, Mr Irving reported that Sellafield Ltd had achieved success with the peer to peer process, with observations up to over 32,000 for the year by approximately 6,000 staff which represents over half of the staff at Sellafield.

27. Mr Irving commented that there have been some disappointments over the year. Sellafield Ltd accepted a formal caution from the Environment Agency regarding the condensate leak event of January 2009. Additionally a recent INES event was raised following the discovery through a plant inspection of some radioactive liquid on the floor under a ventilation system in one of the old legacy buildings which is currently undergoing decommissioning. He confirmed that the area is a legacy area and that the discovery was made as part of the sites own inspections, highlighting the effectiveness of such inspections.
28. Taking the report as read, Mr Irving moved onto operations and endeavoured to update the committee on operational status since the report was written. He reported that it had been a very good year with a few notable exceptions. Starting with the exceptions, he commented that in terms of the Magnox reprocessing plant the site has been far short of set targets. He explained that was initially due to some downstream plants, with mechanical difficulties in the encapsulations plants and one of the effluent plants, but then Magnox reprocessing was up and running, then the site had a steam outage around about the Christmas period and the plant was ramped down, and coinciding with when it was due to come back up again the problem was found with the pipebridge. Mr Irving reminded members about the pipebridge, that SL had been conducting a test and had found that there were some question marks over the integrity of the drip tray, not the pipe carrying the radioactive liquid itself, but the collection point underneath, which is a drip tray. Mr Irving updated the committee that the problem had been found which effectively was a 60 year old weld in that pipebridge. Debris has been cleared from round it, the drip tray has been repaired and Sellafield Ltd was currently carrying out water testing. Mr Irving confirmed that he expected the water test to be successful and to be back up and running imminently.
29. He reported that during the time that Magnox had been out of action, Sellafield Ltd had been carrying out some of the outage work and planned accountancy work for next year which will ensure a very good start. Next year Sellafield Ltd is looking to produce around 800 tonnes, the highest that has been achieved in the last five years is 569.
30. Mr Irving noted disappointment in the Waste Vitrification Lines, stating that Sellafield Ltd has had a series of process and mechanical difficulties there. He continued that the site is planning to have line one back up and running in mid April and are again expecting a good year from the Vitrification process in 2011/12.
31. Mr Irving reported that there have been some real successes, in Thorp, SL started the year looking to hit 200 tonnes, but working with colleagues in NII an inspection of the evaporator was carried out and the site was back up and running within a month. However, there were then problems within Thorp, with the steam outages mentioned earlier and then some process problems with one of the pulsed columns which required a wash out. Mr Irving continued that Thorp has been shearing since January and over the year the site has achieved 350 tonnes. There is a challenging year ahead in the Thorp plant in 2011/12, but the plant is now back up and running.

32. Mr Irving went on to comment that another key area of success was one of SL's flag ship projects the new product store, SPRS. The objective for the year had been to achieve active commissioning by receiving a can of product into that store. Sellafield Ltd received the licence for active commissioning on Christmas Eve and has achieved 35 cans this year so that has been a real success.
33. Mr Irving was pleased to report that there had also been success in MOX. The last of the European fuel assemblies were completed in period 4, but since then, Sellafield Ltd has concentrated on the investment in the new rod line with preparations going very well. The site has also been making great headway in residue management, which is basically a clear out of the plant and the pellets around the plant and reworking those pellets so that when back up and running there will be a clean run at it and that has gone ahead of schedule.
34. Moving onto evaporators, Mr Irving reported that evaporator C has been running since its inspection and evaporator A has been available since late November, although the site hasn't had to use it. The evaporator D project is progressing well, with some very physical changes expected very soon. The link bridge between Thorp and the Management Centre will be removed soon to allow the access for the evaporator modules up the main street on the site. Off site the ramps will be built to bring the modules in from the beach from May onwards. Mr Irving commented that it was real progress that will be very visible sometime very soon.
35. Moving to report on decommissioning, Mr Irving commented that there is some very notable progress made in the Pile Fuel Storage Pond with Sellafield Ltd starting to move skips of fuel for the very first time in decades, consolidating fuel into skips and preparing the export route for those skips. Sellafield Ltd has also notably moved bulk sludge from the pond floor into purpose built stainless steel containment culminating in real risk and hazard reduction achievements in 2010.
36. In the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo, Sellafield Ltd has achieved liquor activity reduction, (247 m³ of active liquid), equivalent to about 1800 TBq of activity. Mr Irving reported that was a real risk reduction and emphasised that was active liquor that has been removed from the silo, ensuring that when the time arrives for the actual retrievals the dose uptake to operators is significantly less.
37. Mr Irving referred to the visible progress of the ventilation stack which has been built on the Sellafield site, it is a 124m chimney, the purpose of which is to redirect some of the ventilation systems from the old separation area to allow the site to make progress on decommissioning of the old systems including some of the Windscale systems including the pile one stack which is the chimney where Sellafield Ltd has been making progress removing debris and equipment from that historic building.
38. In terms of Japan, Mr Irving reported that the first thing Sellafield Ltd did having heard about the events in Japan was to appoint a Response Manager, that being Mr Phil Hallington. Mr Irving went on to say that what has happened in Japan, has clearly been a disaster, however, in comparison, Sellafield clearly, since the shut down of Calder Hall does not have any operating reactors. The site does not have anything like the seismic activity of Japan, with the energy omitted by the

worst earthquake the UK has ever experienced, being approximately 130,000 times less than Japan. However, the Sellafield site does have spent fuel in ponds and a cooling requirement in the high active areas. Mr Irving reported that the site has many diverse power supplies and a reasonable reaction time in those areas. He also reported that the fuel in the ponds has been cooled at source before it arrives at Sellafield with a large amount of it having been at Sellafield a long time, so the site does not have the same heat challenges to those in Japan.

39. Concluding his report, Mr Irving reported that the performance plan has been submitted to the NDA and a stakeholder meeting had been held the previous day which David and Elaine attended which involved ensuring the data from the plan was manageable, legible and usable by the WCSSG when the document is published in the early Summer. Mr Irving expected that would be the document that stakeholders would hold the operators accountable to and was very happy for that.
40. **Q: Tim Knowles:** Ian Hudson, talked about hearts and minds amongst the workforce, I just wonder what the NDA think at the moment in relation to the impact of their VLLW policy which has successfully alienated all three local authorities in West Cumbria as a result of the EA's permission decision this week and isn't it about time that we sorted out the strategy in relation to nuclear waste because it is going to be difficult to progress a number of things unless we resolve these issues quickly.
41. Second point on paragraph 4 in the NDA report, I think practically the second bullet point shows a marked difference between the NDA's perception of MRWS and the local communities and I'm quite sure Elaine had she been here would have raised this, we in West Cumbria are involved in informing the general public about the potential for a GDF consulting them and asking them whether or not in due course they would be interested in engaging, we are not making further progress towards the implementation because there is only one volunteer area in this country and we are at the moment looking to find out what the general public's view is before we go any further.
42. The third point is the bullet point below that, would I understand that the carefully worded sentence is code for what are we going to do about Dounreay, Winfrith and Harwell wastes?
43. and the fourth point is if Thorp throughput is improving and the Vitrification plants performance has been disappointing, does that mean that there is more HLW liquid on the site that we are having to deal with?
44. **A: Ian Hudson:** In terms of the overall strategy, the NDA's position is that we are about implementing what Government policy is, and you will appreciate the Government policy has been updated over recent years, that's really the approach that has been taken, we have consulted quite a bit through that policy, I appreciate that there is an issue locally that people are not happy with licence applications at Lillyhall, but I guess the NDA's position is that it is an issue for the consigners of waste and compliance with Government policy rather than us driving that particular agenda.

45. **Rob Allott:** I appreciate Cumbria County Council is concerned about the decision we made about permitting the Lillyhall Landfill site to receive high volumes of Very Low Level waste. However, their concerns relate to areas which we can't consider in terms of our permitting process. We have considered those areas that we can consider, which is the environmental safety of disposal of the lightly contaminated rubble, which is the sort of waste that will be disposed of to the landfill site. Our decision is very much a technical decision around environmental safety and environmental risk relevant to that disposal and we concluded that it was perfectly acceptable to permit the disposals. It is also in compliance with Government policy, so in terms of the decision it was fairly straight forward. I do understand that there are residual concerns about the proximity principal and the use of that landfill site and clearly Cumbria County Council may wish to engage with others to look at that. What I would also say is that in terms of individual nuclear sites and where they actually dispose of waste, it is still very much within their permits that sites have to demonstrate that they are using best available techniques to actually make that disposal. For example Sellafield themselves may wish to use the Lillyhall landfill as a disposal route, but we will be looking for that case to be made by Sellafield Ltd. Also we will be undertaking readiness inspections, particularly given that there was the incident about this time last year where waste was mis-consigned to the Lillyhall landfill site. We want to be assured that for any new waste disposal routes that are opened, there will be compliance with those disposal arrangements.
46. **Tim Knowles:** The policy issue as far as I am concerned is very simple, the nuclear waste belongs to the NDA and it is for the NDA to resolve these policy issues, I understand the position of the EA, however it does not mean that my authority and my colleagues in Allerdale are considering a legal challenge to what has occurred this week, because of our dissatisfaction with the process and the fact that things like sustainability assessments and BPO don't appear to have been factored into this, so I won't move to talk to you again about the EA issue, but I do look very much to the NDA to resolve these policy issues, its not an easy thing to say it's the Government policy, because the work that underpinned it was done by an organisation for the NDA and then translated into Government policy and there is an integrated responsibility here to produce a suite of solutions to nuclear waste issues and for some reason the NDA has not dealt with this in a strategic manner, hopefully we will be able to do that in the coming weeks, because otherwise there are going to be real problems.
47. **Ian Hudson:** I understand your point, but there has been an integrated approach to strategy but it is maybe something we should discuss outside. Just to cover the three other points, the one about making further progress through implementing Geological disposal, I think it referred to NDA's role in supporting the Government, I appreciate exactly where the local community is in relation to where the council's are in terms of engagement with the local community and actually it is really clear that the engagement goes between the local councils and Government, but NDA does have a role to support Government, depending on what the outcomes of those discussions are, that is what it refers to.
48. In terms of the HAL stocks they are lower this year compared with last year, if you look at the overall performance of Vitrification, last years performance was

really good and quite ahead of target, this year is disappointing, but I am anticipating improvements in Vitrification next year. NDA is absolutely committed to reducing the HAL stocks, it's a clearly identified priority for NDA and we have put a lot of money and priority commitment to that and the site is heavily incentivised not just next year but in the coming years to do well against that set of targets.

49. In terms of movement of nuclear material to optimise the use of NDA sites, it was highlighted in our strategy that one of the things we would be thinking about and considering was the opportunity to consolidate some of the assets across the estate and there is still some work to be done as to whether that is the appropriate thing to do. The thing you talk about in terms of material from places like Dounreay, Sellafield has been receiving material considerably for many years in relation to Magnox and AGR and whilst I appreciate its slightly different material its an extension of a principle, I guess that actually optimises things across the estate, but clearly from our perspective that decision hasn't been made and I don't think we've spent enough time talking to the local community around those ideas, so whilst it is highlighted as a potential opportunity in our strategy, we are clearly very keen to look at that in good consultation with the local community, so that would be the way we would approach it going forwards.
50. **Peter Clements:** I'd just like to add onto Ian's report for Sellafield Ltd, it's a criticism really, I think you are underselling the peer to peer and observations. I think its worth saying that people are picking up on this, people are starting to take part in it and realising the benefit, the Company are realising the benefit and the unions with regards to the correlation for the increase in peer to peer and a slight decrease in safety related incidents and to date despite the adverse group that we had when this kicked off I don't think anyone yet has won a television, however, local charities have benefited by several thousand pounds as a direct result of the peer to peer observations and I think you need to push that as well in future reports.
51. **Mike Davidson:** Thank you chair, I don't want to labour the point much further, but I would just like to put on record, Allerdale's support for Cllr Knowles comments, particularly on the VLLW matter and the influence on the MRWS process.
52. **Paul McKenna:** Iain Irving mentioned the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo and reduction of liquors. On the 24th August last year the event with the hydrogen gas analysers being misconnected, this has been addressed by the NDA's comments in some of the reports and I understand there is a board of enquiry report which will eventually appear from Sellafield Ltd, but could Ian just give us some brief concise information on perhaps the nature or the magnitude of the hazard that would be present if there was hydrogen in the silos?
53. **Ian Irving:** In MSSS, it was detection equipment so it wasn't equipment that would prevent any build up, I want to be clear on that it was purely about detection and there were various other means of detection available to us, nonetheless, that equipment should not have been isolated and that was why we had a board of enquiry. Could I ask Bruce to expand on that?

54. **Bruce:** We did have an incident in MSSS, that occurred because of preparatory work we were carrying out work to remove the material in MSSS, the hydrogen analysers, they exist already but we will have some large retrieval machines moving up and down the floor to remove the material from the silo and the past location of those analysers was in the way of those machines, so what we were doing was moving the analysers up to a level higher and re-piping them basically and there is some very fine tubing that connects those to the compartments themselves. There is hydrogen generation potential within those cells, the levels are actually quite low and there are a number of different ways that we would be able to determine if we have something going on there, temperature particularly would be the issue that we would be worried about, but the time constants in there are very long, it is not a rapid incident scenario, so I'm not familiar with what the ultimate potential scenario would be, but we are operating typically so far from that scenario that its not the creditable event in normal operation nor was it there during that incident. We had other means for monitoring the hydrogen as that was going on.
55. **Paul McKenna:** That reflects what has been said to date by the NII, it seems to allude to other means of picking up hydrogen.
56. **Bruce:** The thing that is concerning and that we have spent a lot of time correcting is that it should never have been left disconnected in the first place, so there is some human behaviour and process issues that we have to take care of, we were not at all concerned about the condition of the facility, it's the behaviours that were manifested in the fact this occurred and that's really where we have concentrated our efforts.
57. **Martin Forwood:** A couple of points for the NDA please, you completely lost me on page two of your presentation in terms of plans for Sellafield, we have old performance plans, new performance plans, baseline plans, there is curiously not a mention of life time plans, what has happened to life time plan 10, is that now made redundant by new performance plans, is it ever going to be put in the public domain, when are we first going to catch sight publicly of what you are planning for the site?
58. **Ian Hudson:** Life time plan 10 is exactly the thing that is being completed this year. For the purpose of the contract, what we do in order to understand the improvements that NMP were bringing to the site, we constructed a number of components as part of life time plan 10, the first component was what we called a contract baseline, which reflected what the site might do if the improvements weren't brought about, the purpose of that contract baseline is nothing more than a means of measuring improvements in efficiency and effectiveness from and is not something we expect the site to deliver, the second component of life time plan 10 is effectively the plan for the site with all the improvements that we expect NMP to bring to the plan applied and what it would mean in terms of the performance in the long term and those two components are the things that can actually make up life time plan 10, so in terms of what we are going to do moving forwards is that the performance plan component is the thing that we will be measuring the success of in terms of the site and the contract baseline is just a contractual mechanism which allows us to measure efficiency. So to give you a practical example, if you extended some of the operations or reprocessing

operations, the throughputs that you've seen over the last few years, what we would look for in the performance plan would be to see some improvements in those and what they would mean in terms of for instance reprocessing, and NMP would be rewarded according to how well they did against the performance plan, it also has elements of, if you look at the legacy ponds and silos areas it enables us to really drive the performance culture in terms of moving waste, treating it, retrieving waste etc. The final bit about when it will be published, we referred to it earlier, it is our intention to publish it with some targets so that this group here can scrutinise how those targets are delivered, I think what I would like to do is use the language of performance plan going forward, that is really it. Just a final wrinkle in terms of the approach, that plan is a life time plan it reflects the full lifetime of Sellafield, its very focused on the next three years, so we won't be going through an exercise of updating that plan for the next three years, we will be changing it as it evolves and as improvements are implemented, but it is really a vehicle for measuring how well the site is performing and that is the real intention so there won't be a wholesale update of that plan for another three years, it will be a constant evolution.

59. **David Moore:** We had the first opportunity yesterday to look at the 2010 plan as it was called, we share your frustrations, we have been waiting a long time, one of the suggestions I made at the meeting, as we are trying to make a comprehensive document into something that is a really usable document and is user friendly was for this group and other NGO's to be given an opportunity to have a look at it at this stage and have some input into how that final document comes out as a format and as a usable document. The information is all there, but its how we put it into a usable document for both ourselves, the local authorities, yourselves and the NGO's to hold the industry to account. Hopefully very shortly you should be getting some contact with regard to having a look at that document for yourself and see if you can assist us in making that a usable document.
60. **Martin Forwood:** Could I just add our support to what Tim Knowles has said, we are very disappointed in the decision by the Agency to grant a permit for the Lillyhall Landfill, I think it is a very retrograde step and sets a really bad precedent for the rest of the UK.
61. **Martin Forwood:** You haven't, apart from one figure you have just mentioned now given any target figures for this coming year in terms of commercial operations, could you provide those, if not today at least sometime pretty soon. Target figures for Thorp, Vitrification and so on.
62. **Iain Irving:** That's the information that will be published in the performance plan or the plan that we have just been referring to, so that will be made public very soon, the figures I have been referring to today are a bit of a sneak preview, but that plan will be available in the coming month and a half, and that's what we will expect to get held to account upon at these meetings from here on in.
63. **Martin Forwood:** I've just noticed that in past year's reports, at the end of year time, you've always given target figures before, it just seems a shame that we don't have them today.

64. **Iain Irving:** That is a function I guess of the changeover in terms of how we are going through the planning cycle, we've just submitted to our customer, we are waiting for feedback from our customer and then we will go public with the targets for next year. It's a changeover in the planning process, so apologies we can't give you them all today Martin, but rest assured they will be with you very soon indeed.
65. **Martin Forwood:** In terms of the Vitrification plant production figures, can you give us them in cans still. You yourself mentioned cans in your presentation, rather than this Uranium tonnes equivalent which may sound impressive, but I work on cans?
66. **Iain Irving:** This year, the charts on the wall include that information, the figure is 96 containers this year and disappointingly, that was against a target of 300.
67. **Martin Forwood:** Finally, you referred to one of the high level waste tanks, number 17, I thought 17 had been operating for years, why has it had to be actively commissioned now?
68. **Graham Sunners:** I think it is actually the duty of the tank that has been changed and its now being brought into use as a full storage tank with additional features, it was a tank that we used to mix the HAL as part of the process going forward.
69. **Phil Hallington:** This reflects the change in designation of the tank from being a designated spare to being brought back into routine service, we don't just turn it on and see what happens, so this is just recording the fact that we have gone through a re-commissioning process, so it is now actively back in service as distinct from one of our designated spares.
70. The Chairman commented that the NDA report wasn't available until two days previous which was due to the timing. The Chair stated that the group will look at the timings of the meeting, unfortunately it falls too close to the year end for them to be able to get the information available, so we may have to look at this date next year as maybe a couple of weeks later to allow everyone to have their year end figures available and reported in time.
71. **ITEM 5 – REVIEW OF THE WCSSG – DAVID COLLIER**
72. Mr Collier thanked those members who had helped with the review. He had spoken to over 20 people in a structured way and quite a lot more informally.
73. He explained that it was a report that tries to collate what people think within the group and amongst their stakeholders rather than his recommendations/plans for the future.
74. He reported that his findings indicated that the group does and has achieved much and has a vital role, that was clear and everyone agreed on that and when thinking of change the group shouldn't lose what works well, so it was a case of evolution rather than wholesale change. He reported that there was no consensus

in terms of an alternative. Mr Collier suggested that it should be taken forward at a detailed level through a working group.

75. Mr Collier went on to say that he wished to highlight five basic points. The first being that if the group is going to look at its activities, the first test would be, if the site stakeholder group disappeared, what is it that the community would lose that the community really valued. For example if you look at partnership and determine whether the local authorities in various combinations are handling that, could that be better integrated, could more of the partnership working be taken outside of that. On the other hand, say, well what about oversight, is this an area where it is only the SSG that provides an independent voice or would pick up something that is a particular problem if there was a problem, or where people can come and raise a concern, for example Fukushima, you can come and raise concerns about the implications there and the SSG if it was being responsive might organise some event to inform people.
76. In terms of Oversight, Mr Collier reported that it could be tougher, and that it is currently quite benign, (not withstanding what people had been saying at the meeting today), it is quite often a benign environment. Some of the other site stakeholder groups are a bit tougher and he felt it would be easy to make some changes to the way that is organised.
77. In terms of Communications, Mr Collier commented that nobody has pointed to alternatives, but they have pointed to the fact that communications to the community tend to stop sometimes at the level of the people around the WCSSG table and communications to be effective need to reach down into the community to bring concerns up and the things that are said at the WCSSG meeting need to be fed back, in some areas it works well and some it doesn't.
78. He went on to say that talking about things like Fukushima, it is clear there is an appetite for less routine, where it is possible, less report and question round a big table and use a variety of formats, not everybody likes contributing around a big table there are lots of things that can be done in different formats and he'd started to see events where different formats had been used and had worked really well, so it's a case of don't be afraid to use different formats where it is appropriate. (note from secretariat – every other WCSSG meeting for the last 4 or 5 years has been an event and not in the traditional format of the main scrutiny meetings).
79. He continued that the group is going to struggle if the target is to involve significant numbers of the public in coming to meetings or to draw in significant numbers of new members because it is a challenge - Why should they? Is the question that you have got to answer and part of the answer is in relevance, interests, topicality and part of it is in the things we have just mentioned which is interesting, dynamic formats, that is interesting and exciting to be part of.
80. With regard to sub groups, the same test needs applied, if a sub group disappeared what core business would the WCSSG actually lose, what would the community lose from it not being there. Opinions varied, quite a few didn't know what the other sub groups did in any detailed sense, that was a general point, so you might not find it an easy question to answer, but what would you lose.

81. He suggested that specifics could be dealt with another time and was happy to answer questions.
82. In conclusion, Mr Collier suggested that the group needed to consider concession planning for Martin Forward because, everybody he had talked to felt that he has a very positive role and the place would be worse off without him.
83. The Chairman thanked Mr Collier for his report and continued that he had circulated a suggested way forward. He asked if there were any questions.
84. **Ron Hargreaves:** It's a question really, right on the very last paragraph, when it says 'a wide variety of improvements in these and other areas have been suggested to us', but then you don't tell us what they are, I would have thought a list, without any judgement on them would have been quite interesting to see what people had thought, because when I read that, I don't know, how many, what are they, are they a way out or are they sensible in my view and it would have been useful to have seen a list.
85. **David Collier:** I was trying to keep it to a fairly high level and a fairly reasonable length and what I thought was going to happen was you were going to have a working party set up afterwards and I would feed in along with everybody else, those things that had been mentioned to me. But what I didn't want to do was set up a discussion that went straight off at a detailed level, because for me you have to think about this at a high level first and say what is it we are trying to achieve here and then when you have thought about that, then examine the detail. So I understand the point Ron, but that is what I tried to do.
86. **Ron Hargreaves:** I think also, the report itself could do with a bit of proof reading there is the odd word missing or the odd word inserted twice and things like that, its not trivial but its not important from the sense point of view about from one or two points where I think it is not quite clear what the paper is saying.
87. **Stewart Kemp:** Part of my thunder has been stolen by the previous question because the County Council in reading this report, it doesn't recognise many if not all of the points which the County Council made, it simply doesn't come through in this summary. I don't know whether a more detailed report will be available bringing out more clearly, both positive points and the negative points which various interviewees will have made, because in summarising it in this way we are losing in a sense the information which would have been brought forward, which could inform the workshop that the Chair is proposing for a future date.
88. **David Collier:** Yes well to some extent the same thing applies. What I didn't want to do, because the basis on which things were made was it was anonymous, what I didn't do was any kind of analysis of who said what. There were some strongly made points which were actually in a minority of one or two and some of the County Council views were opposite to some of the other views, so rather than get into a debate, you should be able to see the issues you've raised in there, its just I haven't said who said what or what it was. So if you think of partnership working, I know we have talked about it before, you will see I have said that partnership working is an issue, why, there is a lot going on outside and

there is significant overlaps with the work of the group that needs sorted out, you don't have enough resource to do everything and I said at the start, some of the people who are involved in this basically don't have the time and they are not getting enough from it and if we don't do more focusing it is going to be lost, so on those for me two of the key points that you made and I've tried to pull those straight through for you. The trouble is, when you take views which are different and you overlay them the risk is you end up with something that is neutral, where it might not have been neutral, the views that you are talking about might have been quite strongly held in the first place, but you overlay strongly held views going in different directions where is the centre of gravity its pretty neutral, so I think that with hindsight there might have been better ways to do it, but that's why its ended up sounding more neutral than some of the points made. I have to say the vast majority of the interviewees were actually not unhappy with the way things were, there are some people who feel very strongly about major changes, a lot of people do not.

89. **Stewart Kemp:** My response to that in a sense would be, if you read the report you get the impression because the word is used many times that there is some consensus about the way forward and I think as David said, there may be some strongly held criticisms, there may be some really strongly held views of support for the existing work programme and if we are going to carry forward the review, we need to understand and people around the table need to see what those points are rather than being merged into a neutral summary.
90. **Norman Clarkson:** Under conclusions, the second line down, I'd like to know what you mean, the correlation between the two – many members are involved in initiatives to bring new nuclear jobs to the area, and yet they also have to be seen to be tough on the industry when required and perform an effective scrutiny role. Personally, I don't have a problem, I'm on decommissioning but I will do whatever I can wherever I can on getting jobs not only to the industry but getting associated work and also other industries as well, but that doesn't stop me from wherever I need to be tough on anything and its very rare that I have to be tough, because that's the whole point of the scrutiny that we have, it keeps the industry accountable to us and I think that's one of the reasons as well as the people that control and scrutinise Sellafield itself keeps the industry safe and that's the good thing about it to point out to other people that could come here and create other jobs and other industries and not to be afraid of the nuclear industry, so I would like to know what your feelings are about that.
91. **David Collier:** Well that's exactly right, I've captured your position precisely then haven't I. In that members are involved in initiatives to bring nuclear jobs and yet you also have to be seen to be tough in asking questions and we've seen examples of that today. I think its just a recognition of the fact that in this forum you have to wear more than one hat, and that there are things to do simultaneously.
92. **Mike Davidson:** I'm not in any way wanting to question the report which I found was quite a useful document, but in view of the fact that we have got local elections coming up, some of us may not be here any more, I want to take an opportunity if I may Chair and speak a little about the Commercial sub committee. We have in the past delved deeply into technical issues of the

commercial activities on the Sellafield site, we have also tried to look at the financial issues of both the Sellafield site and the NDA and to my mind this is a very difficult mixture to try and balance and a very difficult process for us to undertake in two meetings a year and I would like the working party in the future to look at this process and wonder perhaps if these two overviews should be split.

93. **Chairman:** I'd like to look at the way forward, I did circulate a paper so we didn't have to go into any length today. We have picked up the five key themes that came out of David's report as a starting point, and I want to put together a workshop obviously of those who are interested in taking this forward to look at the opportunities. The reason we did a review is that we know that you can continue to improve and that is what we strive to do, so from today, I would like to say we will put together a workshop of all interested parties that want to attend to look at the way forward and deal with the issues raised in the report. It's always difficult with a subject like this to attract lots of members of the public and it does seem to be those who are interested in it. If there are things we can improve to bring more members of the public in, we also want to look at that. I think another thing that will improve our way forward is when we get the Sellafield plan and have a real document that we can really start some serious scrutiny work on the industry through which will be the work done by the sub-committees. We will set up that workshop as of today and if those who are interested in partaking could let Rosina know and we'll get a date to suit everybody to make an early start on that and also we will take up David's offer to be able to come along and feed in the information that he picked up through all the interviews that he did and I know he spent a long time doing a lot of interviews with a lot of people and I join with him in thanking those members that took the time to take part in that. David will be able to feed that back into that process, so if we could just let Rosina know if you are interested in being involved in the workforce.
94. **ITEM 6 – LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY REPORT – DICK RAAZ**
95. The Chairman invited Dick Raaz to represent the LLW report.
96. Mr Raaz began by stressing the Fukushima event had been pretty distressing to the world and the industry, LLWR has reviewed some of the immediate impact issues and that based on the very nature of the materials that it deals with at LLWR the site is pretty much inherently safe against the Fukushima type events, in that the waste is not heat generating and a lot of the distress simply does not appear at LLWR. He reported that there had been quite a bit of work done from the Thailand tsunami 2004 that had been analysed from the UK perspective that has been reviewed and LLWR is quite confident that such a scenario would not apply on that scale and Mr Raaz hoped that the committee understood that.
97. He continued that there is a lot of work going on into the upcoming year. The Environmental Safety Case being one of the most important. The Environmental safety case will be submitted to the Environment Agency before the end of this month, so that LLWR can meet statutory requirements to submit it before May 1st. That document will describe the way that waste will be managed at LLWR to protect workers, the surrounding public and the environment and future generations. Mr Raas said it would be impossible to over emphasise the

importance of this analysis, because it will be for the rest of this century hopefully. The objective is to submit the safety case by May 1st, he stressed it was a very complicated, very aluminous set of reports and analysis, over 1500 pages in the top tier document alone.

98. Mr Raaz continued that a lot of work had been undertaken with the LLWR sub committee under Chairman Brown's work to ensure that there has been a fair forecast of the issues that will be addressed by the safety case. It will be used to form the description of how the site will physically evolve once the safety case is approved, an important factor for sub committee members and Mr Raaz felt for the main WCSSG membership too. What is the site physically going to look like over the next few decades and on towards the end of the century.
99. Mr Raaz continued that the site has been doing a number of briefings on what the site optimisation will look like, it will describe the cap, the cut off walls, the materials that are used to isolate the waste from the environment as well as describe the physical layout of the site. Because it is so complicated and has so many different features LLWR has decided to take the planning application and instead of segment it into little pieces put them all together for the long view of what the totality of the impact on the site is going to be.
100. It will cover, seventy, eighty or ninety years of forward looking work on the site, Mr Raaz wanted to assure the committee that the application has reasonable break points every ten years to review the current situation here in the UK and in Cumbria of what is happening to waste management. It gives a pretty comprehensive picture of what the site will look like and at the same time builds in assurances that there are points where oversights such as this group will have an opportunity to input to the next phase. Put simply there would be break points as the larger pieces of construction occur, vaults, capping etc.
101. Mr Raaz continued that there is work ongoing in the old Plutonium Contaminated Material (PCM) facilities, the magazines, commenting there had been great progress this year. Work pack one on magazines 4 and 10 is surface decontamination inside the magazine where the materials were stored. Both 4 and 10 had fee producing milestones this year, which LLWR is going to meet. Mr Raaz continued that they will be moving onto magazine 9 this year, and letting the contracts for the ventilation systems inside those magazines this week..
102. In terms of demolition of those magazines Mr Raaz reported that LLWR will be holding the demolition phase as long as possible to coincide with capping work and vault construction in order to minimise the industrial impact on the surrounding community. LLWR does not want too much heavy equipment driving up and down the highways, however the absence of that work should not be interpreted that there isn't a lot of work going on, he commented that LLWR is also in the decommissioning business at these facilities, albeit not on as huge as scale as Sellafield Ltd but nevertheless LLWR is involved in decommissioning as well as waste management.
103. Moving on to report on the work underway on setting the National waste management strategy, Mr Raaz reported that the work is progressing very well.

Metals were up and running in September 2009, this year combustibles are on line and Mr Raaz emphasised that was very important to the nation in ensuring that LLWR will satisfy the mission needs for pretty much all of the waste that is anticipated to come from Gen 1 decommissioning. That has been LLWR's objective and the safety case when approved with whatever caveats come with it, should allow LLWR to manage Gen I decommissioning without the need for another repository anywhere in the country.

104. Mr Raaz commented that LLWR is carrying out site upgrades, the NDA asked LLWR to accelerate the work that was planned for 2011/12 into last year. He reported that an electrical system on site is about 50 years old and it has been upgraded to modern codes. The work is almost complete and Mr Raaz reported that he was very pleased with how that went.

105. Mr Raaz reported that the last point he wished to report is that LLWR is an international stage for the UK. When waste management schemes were being looked at just five years ago, it would have been fair to say that the UK was lagging behind, today he thought that the UK is at the front of sophisticated waste management, LLWR is receiving a lot of attention from foreign delegations and most recently the site had a party of Bulgarians, who were quite surprised to find out how close the public is to the facility; that really caught their attention. He encouraged members to offer visits to LLWR to anybody they felt appropriate. The site will host any responsible group to come and see what LLWR is doing.

106. **Tim Knowles:** It's more of a comment actually. Clearly the planning application I can't comment on - it would be a matter of process which the County Council will determine through the appropriate committee in due course when it is presented. What I would like to do is just contrast what is a strategic dialogue about how one deals with these issues in the long term, in terms of the LLWR experience with the repository, there is a good constructive amount of long term thinking about the way in which all these things will impact upon the community and on Cumbria as a whole and the contrast of that to the VLLW situation, which to put it mildly looks like a charter for multi nationals to buy holes in the ground and then make profits out of the UK tax payer but depositing VLLW in a completely ad hoc way. What I hope is that the NDA and others involved will learn lessons from what is a good partnering approach which comes up with what looks to me and I think a lot of people a good strategic process of coming to a conclusion and really understand that there is no mileage at all doing things against the interest and against the wishes of local authorities and local communities. I just wanted to highlight that, there is a good news story here, there is a good way to do things, it doesn't have to be about conflict and argument, what it needs is sensible dialogue between the people involved in solving the problem.

107. **AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM STUDSVIK – MIKE MCMULLEN**

108. Mr McMullen wished to reflect on the last report that identified that the operations had been sporadic in nature and there had been peaks and troughs in

operation. He reported that had now improved and Studsvik has received waste from the sites on a more regular basis which has culminated in the MRF meeting its full design targets in the month of March based on current shift patterns and working patterns.

109. Going back, Mr McMullen stated that Studsvik started operations in September 2009 up until 2010, due to the sporadic nature there was very little benefited, but what has been demonstrated over the last six months is that Studsvik has directed approximately 1300 m³ away from LLWR, that is container volume not actual volume of waste which essentially equates to around 65 half height isofreight containers that would have been destined to go into the vault at LLWR.
110. The site has been able to utilise a lot of its techniques and in doing so demonstrating that there is best available techniques out there for the recycling of metals including VLLW and like colleagues at Cumbria County Council, Mr McMullen reported that Studsvik do share concerns that the VLLW route does open up a disposal route for metals, He had seen several reports that identifies redundant plant equipment as one of the options to go into the site which was quite clearly metal.
111. Mr McMullen updated the committee on the Health, Safety, Environment and Security. The company had reached 1 million man hours without a lost time accident in December, which still continues. There have been no lost time accidents and the site had just been notified that for the second time in three years it has been awarded the sector award for the construction and Engineering from Prosper.
112. Mr McMullan reported that over the last period Studsvik has been trying to establish its local liaison committee with the local parish councils and Allerdale Borough Council. That had taken place in February and had been quite successful. The site is now looking into how it can expand that into the local business area of Lillyhall. He explained that the Lillyhall business area is quite big and diverse, and it was a question as to whether to concentrate on local to the site although the site cannot create an off site hazard Studsvik wished to keep local businesses up to date with what it did.
113. In conclusion, Mr McMullan reported that with the increase in operations the site has been able to develop a lot more employment opportunities and has employed four more people for the short term based on the throughput and if that is sustained the site will be looking to continue that recruitment drive. He confirmed that covered non skilled, semi skilled and skilled as well as technical and administration jobs.
114. **Ron Hargreaves:** Are there any plans to move to have a smelter in West Cumbria?
115. **Mike McMullen:** At the moment, no there isn't, there was back in the early days. It all depends on the throughput and the viability and the economic expenses that would cost. We have looked at the cost of a smelter but it was due to the fact at that time that there was an indication from the EA that the transfrontier shipment route might be closed a lot earlier than expected so at the moment there are no

plans to look at that again, but the initial costs were quite extreme, so there would have to be a real viable business case to enable us to do that

116. **Dick Raaz:** From a national perspective, the NDA has asked us at LLWR to advise them and the supply chain on the desirability of things like that, it is a very important question because it requires us to understand the arisings of materials that will require that kind of service and to see where it can best be provided. So the business case has to be reviewed against a reasonable person's understanding of what decommissioning is going to produce and what could come from outside the Gen I decommissioning that would support commercial companies such as Studsvik making the investment decision. We do try pretty hard to look at big questions like that and give comprehensive advice, not just to the NDA but on behalf of the whole country in terms of low level waste and to a certain extent ILW. It's a very interesting question and there is quite a bit of work going on to help us understand what is the right answer because we are going to have to have a good answer that will cover the next 70 years.
117. **Ron Hargreaves:** Thank you for that, it seems in a simple minded way obvious, but much radioactivity is a few egg cups full or tea spoons full of material, are they spread liberally over the top or within a very large volume of completely non radioactive material and anything we can do to separate the one from the other and reverse enthalpy for a while would be very handy and given it is big enough, clearly the Swedes think it is worthwhile shipping some stuff to their smelter, it would be an interesting task, but taking on board of course it has to be viable.
118. **Dick Raaz:** There are several companies involved in it, there are melters in Germany and the US it just starts snowballing in complexity when you bring in everything that is underway.
119. **ITEM 8 – NII REPORT – IAN TAIT**
120. Dr Tait wished to highlight some of the key points from the report and give a brief update on what has been happening since the last reporting period following which he would be pleased to take any comments.
121. Dr Tait reported that the Office for Nuclear Regulation was set up on the 1st April as a non statutory body, the ONR will comprise, NII, OCNS and the Department For Transport, and the DfT will join in due course.
122. The ONR will take the form of an agency until legislation is put in place to convert the ONR into a statutory body, so from now on NII does not exist, NII inspectors will now be ONR inspectors.
123. Nuclear decommissioning, legacy silos, the active commissioning of the 3rd extension Liquor Activity Reduction project, in the Magnox Swarf Storage Silo has been completed successfully and there has been successful liquor transfers since then without incident.
124. In addition, the commissioning of the new argon passive off-gas system for the Pile Fuel Clad Storage Silo was successfully completed.

125. Moving to Legacy Ponds, Dr Tait reported that Sellafield Ltd successfully completed a number of projects, on the First Generation Magnox Storage Pond, which support risk reduction and these included the isolation of redundant pipework and the isolation of high level service lines.
126. With regard to Calder Hall, the safe removal of a top duct was successfully undertaken.
127. In terms of Windscale, Dr Tait commented that ONR welcomed SL's decision to merge Windscale into the Decommissioning Directorate as this will facilitate the sharing of resources and decommissioning knowledge.
128. Dr Tait reported that a small quantity of contaminated liquor was found on a redundant Plutonium Purification Plant following inspections by Sellafield Ltd. The leakage exceeded reportable limits, the Minister has been informed and ONR is satisfied with the actions being taken by Sellafield Ltd.
129. In line with ONR's revised strategy with regulating decommissioning, Dr Tait reported that ONR has worked with SL on revising their arrangements that cover decommissioning. ONR issued a Specification to approve, ie freeze these arrangements and we will use these arrangements and associated milestones to regulate decommissioning in the future.
130. With regard to site wide matters, Dr Tait reported that the performance plans for the legacy ponds and silos were received and show an acceleration of the retrieval periods from the Lifetime 10 Contract Baseline. ONR believe that these plans represent ambitious, but credible programmes of work.
131. Reporting on the Voluntary Severance Programme, Dr Tait stated that from the sample assessments ONR undertook, ONR judged that the proposed release of personnel was acceptable, and ONR has worked with Sellafield Ltd on the close out of issues arising from the programme.
132. He continued that ONR inspection work, together with the occurrence of several events, led ONR to conclude that leadership and management need to be improved across the site, Sellafield Ltd accepted that improvements are needed and two constructive meetings had been held with senior management during the reporting period.
133. ONR held a workshop on Internal Regulation with Sellafield Ltd which was followed up with a very constructive meeting at Bootle. Sellafield Ltd is drafting proposals on the way forward which will be shared with ONR in the near future.
134. Dr Tait reported that the level 1 demonstration exercise originally planned for November was eventually cancelled due to poor weather.
135. In order to gain confidence in Sellafield's emergency arrangements, ONR has enhanced the witnessing of emergency exercises by adding four high hazard facility exercises per year.
136. Moving onto Operations and Spent Fuel Management, ONR raised concerns about the delays to the Magnox Operating Programme (MOP), and the committee

had heard earlier that there have been further delays due to problems with pipebridge 3. ONR continue to work with Sellafield Ltd and others on contingency arrangements and with Sellafield Ltd on the return to service of pipebridge 3.

137. ONR continued to monitor the dosing trials on THORP Receipt and Storage and it is likely that these trials will be extended.
138. Sellafield Ltd completed the necessary work which allowed ONR to close out the THORP Improvement Notice, which was issued in August 2008 on engineering substantiation.
139. Reporting on Sellafield Product and Residue Store (SPRS), Dr Tait confirmed ONR was satisfied with Sellafield Ltd's application to commence active commissioning, and so ONR issued a relevant licence instrument.
140. Moving onto HALES, the HAL stocks were controlled within the Specification and, as mentioned in previous reports, ONR hopes to issue a revised Specification in the future. When the revised Specification is issued, details will be put on the ONR website and Dr Tait will provide a summary in the relevant stakeholder report.
141. Dr Tait reported that Sellafield Ltd made suitable improvements which allowed ONR to close out both the Improvement Notices issued on HALES.
142. Dr Tait moved onto matters of interest which have arisen since the end of the reporting period. With regards to performance plans, ONR has now received all the performance plans for the site.
143. With regards to Leadership and Management, ONR held another constructive meeting on the way forward.
144. Dr Tait confirmed that the Stores Inventory Retrieval Project was successfully completed in March.
145. In relation to Evaporator D, Dr Tait reported that a Licence Instrument was issued around the end of March which permitted the construction and later dismantling of the gantry crane.
146. Dr Tait also mentioned since the end of the reporting period there had been the tragic events at Japan, and the accident at the Fukushima nuclear power station.
147. Following the accident, the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, Mr Chris Huhne, requested Mike Weightman, ONR's Chief Inspector, to produce a report on the implications for the UK nuclear industry.
148. Dr Tait noted that the report is not a review. The purpose of the report is to identify any lessons to be learnt and the Secretary of State has asked for an interim report by the middle of May and the final report in September.
149. Given the timing and the fact that there is likely to be only limited information available, the scope for the interim report will necessarily be less comprehensive

than the final report. It will focus on any immediate lessons to be learnt for existing nuclear power stations in the UK, and for any prospective nuclear power stations.

150. **Tim Knowles:** I'd like this to be taken in the spirit that it is meant, I'm not meaning to be humorous, but the level 1 demonstration exercises, the exercise was rescheduled, unfortunately due to severe weather, the exercise was not carried out, are we not going to have emergencies in severe weather then?
151. **Ian Tait:** Yes, of course there may be emergencies in severe weather. The original level 1 exercise was planned for November and if you read in our report, there was an actual event on the day. This meant we couldn't carry out the exercise because the team who we were going to examine were actually involved in a real event. The exercise was therefore put back to December but the weather was so severe then we couldn't get to the site. Also the scenario actually involved the fire brigade spraying a lot of water around which was the last thing we wanted in freezing and icy conditions as it could result in someone being injured. We therefore had to decide whether to postpone the exercise, bearing in mind that we were coming up to the next level 1 exercise in the coming year and that Sellafield at the time had a lot of preparatory work to do on level 2 exercise OSCAR. We judged that because the actual performance by Sellafield in the level 1 earlier in the year was very good, and because Sellafield had a lot of emergency planning work to prepare for exercise OSCAR it would be sensible to cancel the exercise.
152. **Chairman:** I will just add, as I was in attendance, there was a lot of good learning came out of the events that happened, probably some better learning than having an exercise.
153. **Martin Forwood:** Just once again to agree with Tim Knowles, I find it quite extraordinary that this exercise should have been cancelled, I understand Ian's reasons that he has just given but surely those are the very circumstances under which exercises should be carried out. It's no good saying well it's the wrong weather or staff are too busy preparing for another exercise that is going to take place next month. Quite ridiculous. If I could just ask one question, which I found very curious and that is 'the loss of wastewater', I don't quite understand that, you didn't lose wastewater presumably, I take it you mean you lost water from wastewater.
154. **Ian Tait:** Yes your right sorry about that, it was the loss of water from wastewater.
155. **Martin Forwood:** and what was the actual incident that you refer to on the 4th of November?
156. **Ian Tait:** That was the loss of water from wastewater.
157. **Martin Forwood:** OK, that never seemed to have surfaced in the public domain at all, I don't know whether you have written anything about it.
158. **Ian Tait:** I'm not sure if it was reported in the public domain.

159. **Martin Forwood:** Can you say which facilities on site were affected by the loss of water.
160. **Ian Tait:** Quite a few facilities were affected by it. To give you a bit of background, a lot of work goes into agreeing a scenario for these exercises with the licensee and a lot of work was done by the licensee and ourselves getting teams together. It is not a simple matter of changing the scenario on the day, its just not feasible. The loss of water from wastewater affected several plants that the teams were wanting to observe during the demonstration exercise. Staff on these plants were fully tied up in the real event and we judged that to have the exercise the next day when these people had been working all the previous day dealing with the real event would not be sensible. Sellafield has shared with us the lessons learnt from the wastewater event and we will be progressing the actions arising from the event during our regular meetings with the emergency planning team.
161. **Martin Forwood:** Thanks Chairman, if I can just point out the relevance really, in light of what has been happening in Japan and loss of coolant waters any incident like that is clearly of some concern, the loss of coolant from wastewater.
162. **Iain Irving:** Just very briefly on that incident, we had lost water, it was all to do with basically a hole in one of the main pipes coming from the wastewater area, but what we did is then employed one of our backup supplies, so we had the borehole supplies and we were able to function very normally. The reason the teams were called in at the time was to look at those areas which didn't need that water supply and to shut it off from them, so it was very much mitigation of any long term effects, a very conservative approach but the supplies to the critical areas were very much there for those plants.
163. **Martin Forwood:** Could I just finally ask on that point, it would be very useful in terms of putting in a submission to the ONR's review to find out what exactly the state of these pipes is. Are they still the old original pipes that service Sellafield from Wastwater or have they ever been renewed?
164. **Iain Irving:** They have now, but whether they were prior to that I can't answer here. I will have to look into that for you Martin, we will come back to you with an answer on that one.
165. **Chairman:** That will be circulated to all members.
166. **Peter Clements:** Yes Chairman, I think rather than criticising the regulator and the company for cancelling an exercise due to bad weather, I think we should congratulate the company and the regulator for having the forethought for thinking about people's safety and taking that first rather than just carry on regardless.
167. **Paul McKenna:** Just a very quick point, the wastewater pipeline leak, there is report of it in the 1st September – 30th November 2010 quarterly report from ONR It doesn't appear in a concise reference form in the one that was circulated to us, the members have got to go and look on the website to see it and this is one of the slight short comings of just having the latest quarterly report circulated,

you have to always double check previous ones which you may not have looked at, just to check that there has been an event which doesn't have a subsequent report.

168. **Chairman:** I think it may be useful if we circulate some information about that particular event and what has been taken over since then and what has been done with regard to infrastructure as well. If that can be included in the SL report and circulated, it will clear up a number of anomalies.

169. **Tim Knowles:** Just one point, it's because the ONR now has this much broader remit and I just ask the question, is anyone looking at the fact that alongside this apparently we don't know about it because we are not clear draconian new set of security regulations which appear to be moving into the way that Sellafield is run. I understand there is an assessment being done about what is deemed necessary, but on the other side of the forest we have the entire site put at risk by the failure of a 50 year old water pipe, now I know Sellafield Ltd is replacing all the water pipes, but in terms of threats to the site, I hope now the new super improved regulator is going to take an holistic view of things like this, there is no point in having extra fences and more police and things like that and 100 yards down the road something that can put the entire site at risk by stopping a water pipe so I just hope that the wonderful new ONR with its ex NDA and Scottish and Southern Electric head are going to be thinking about things like that.

170. **Ian Tait:** We have been and we still are thinking about that.

171. **Peter Connelly:** In view of what Mr Forward said before and about the Japanese experience and if the cooling water from wastewater wasn't available, the backup situation often used to be from Florence Mine, what is the new backup situation, if the water from Wasdale now isn't available when an awful lot of cooling water is needed if there is an emergency.

172. **Chairman:** I think what I said earlier, we will pull together a report that covers that event and what mitigation has been put in place for the future and that will all be covered in a report to everybody.

173. **ITEM 9 - REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY – ROB ALLOTT**

174. Dr Allott reported that with regards to the condensate leak, EA invited Sellafield Ltd to accept a formal caution in relation to the leak of radioactive liquor condensate in the Magnox Reprocessing area. The leak was detected in January in 2009 EA completed its investigation and that was the sanction. The Companies Managing Director and the EHS&Q Director came to the EA office in Penrith to sign the caution and they expressed strong assurances that the learning from that event had been understood and was going to be used to drive improvements, so EA was reassured by what they had said.

175. With regard to the Calder Landfill Extension Segregated Area (CLESA) on the Sellafield site, EA has agreed to an extension to operations of that landfill site, the phase 2 part of the site. EA has provided that agreement by letter, but will be done formally through the variation to the permit which will be happening shortly and EA is expecting an application from Sellafield Ltd on that.

176. Dr Allott reported that the permit for the Waste Recycling Ltd lillyhall landfill site has now been put in place for high volume VLLW.
177. He reported that the EA is expecting the Environmental safety case for the LLWR at the end of the month and as part of that EA has already done an inspection of the records associated with that project and is quite satisfied with what it has seen there in terms of the records.
178. Dr Allott reported on the beach particles and stated that during the period there has been some notable finds. There were some additional investigation surveys and at Whitehaven, Sellafield Ltd found 8 alpha-rich particles and one beta-rich particle and at Harrington 2 alpha-rich particles were detected. Prior to this only two particles had been found North of St Bees head, so clearly that was a development. At the moment Dr Allott confirmed it was too early to say whether that actually indicates a more northerly migration of particle population or if it is just a fact that Sellafield Ltd is using a much better detection system, the synergy detection system, which is able to detect alpha particles much more readily. Clearly one of the objectives for the forward programme is to actually understand what is happening in terms of that migration.
179. Adding to that Dr Allott reported that the beta-rich particle found at Whitehaven was the highest activity beta particle found to date. Also a 1×10^6 Bq Cs-137 contaminated stone was found at the Sellafield beach and that was the highest activity found to date on the programme.
180. All of those are well below EA's threshold for action and as far as the Health Protection Agency is concerned, their risk assessment and their advice remains valid that no special precautions are necessary to protect the public. Dr Allott confirmed that was an important point.
181. Dr Allott reported that the other area to mention is that there is a proposal from Sellafield Ltd to reduce the amount of monitoring for this year to allow for focus specifically on a couple of key objectives, one of which is to understand the northerly migration mentioned above and another is to understand how much re-population particles is happening on the beach. At the moment EA has accepted that proposal, however, EA is awaiting a much more detailed substantiation that the programme will meet those objectives. Dr Allott added that the Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment (COMARE) have been quite critical of the proposed reduction of the programme and are also very keen to see the justification.
182. Dr Allott reported that there had been an issue regarding potentially elevated doses to the actual workers conducting the beach monitoring which was subjected to a detailed review and a peer review by the Health Protection Agency. The issue was around biological monitoring results. It was concluded that there was no dose to the workers so the actual estimated dose was not confirmed and equally there was no risk to members of the public, because the exposure scenarios would only give very low doses.
183. **Chairman:** When you talk about the beach particles, have they mainly been found due to the fact that you have improved technology?

184.**Rob Allott:** The beta-rich particle find rate has actually gone down now, so that is quite reassuring. The alpha-rich particles have increased, yes clearly the better detection system must be a major factor in that, but we don't wish to just jump to that conclusion, we wish the programme to more clearly understand whether that is the case. As you remove these alpha-rich particles we may then see a decline. I should have also said, we are very keen to progress a much better understanding of the off shore situation, so we are pushing Sellafield Ltd to actually do characterisation of what is actually on the sea bed, because it is a big uncertainty at the moment and clearly there could be re-population occurring from that.

185.**Martin Forwood:** Thanks Chairman, could you just confirm about the beach monitoring workers and plutonium levels, are you now saying that there was no plutonium contamination.

186.**Rob Allott:** There is no firm conclusion as to what exactly happened with the biological monitoring results. One of the conclusions that is perfectly plausible is that there was cross contamination of the sample, so basically, it wasn't a real intake, it was just contamination of the sample itself. There was no firm conclusion as to why there was an elevated biological result which basically started this concern.

187.**Martin Forwood:** But it did turn up in a biological sample?

188.**Rob Allott:** Yes it did, there was subsequent biological monitoring which found nothing.

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

190.**DECOMMISSIONING SUB COMMITTEE – NORMAN CLARKSON & RON HARGREAVES**

191.The report was taken as read, any issues had been covered during the meeting. There had been a detailed discussion on hazard and risk reduction which the committee found extremely beneficial, Mr Hargreaves stated that it was a pity there were not many people in attendance to benefit from it.

192.**SOCIO ECONOMIC SUB COMMITTEE – DAVID MOORE**

193.The Chairman of the Socio Economic sub committee was not in attendance, the WCSSG Chairman commented that the report mainly covered the events of the 6th January where a full stakeholder meeting met to discuss the issue of socio economics primarily about the supply chain, there had been a lot of people there that day and a lot of ground was covered.

194.**ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE – PROF JOHN HAYWOOD**

195.The report was taken as read. Professor Haywood noted that the report had been edited down to one page of A4 from 34 pages of minutes, so it is very concise. The full minutes could be viewed on the WCSSG website.

196. **Martin Forwood:** I'm sure it is because it is edited down, but at the last meeting you had, there was a discussion about this German study and childhood cancer around nuclear power stations in Germany. Everything had been put on hold until a review had been carried out by COMARE and I understand that review has now been completed and I wondered whether you knew that, had sight of it and what you are going to do about it.

197. **Professor Haywood:** Thank you Martin, I was not aware of that, I looked at their website yesterday and there is no mention of it. If you can tell me where I can get a copy of their report, I'd be delighted to view it.

198. EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE – DAVID MOORE

199. Mr Moore began by mentioning the issue of OSCAR that had previously been discussed, the recovery exercise is now going to be part of the main exercise, so there will be no requirement for a 9.5.

200. Mr Moore reported that the Emergency Planning sub committee had received a very interesting presentation on the liability arrangements should there be an incident at Sellafield that had off site implications for the community, particularly in light of the numerous questions received by NDA and Sellafield with regards to the after events in Japan ie: if something happened here, who has the liability, who picks up the costs of the work that local authorities would be doing, local householders, businesses, communities. Mr Moore stated that he was planning to arrange for the next meeting for the NDA to give that presentation to the full meeting as he felt it would be very reassuring to listen to what is covered and the amount of money that is available if events take place with off site implications.

201. Another issue that the EPSC has concluded is regarding the evacuation of schools. Currently coaches would be sent to evacuate schools if required, that however, has always raised concerns and Mr Moore thought the regulator had raised the issue also, the fact that we may not be able to get the buses or the bus drivers at the right time, or would bus drivers want to take their buses into what may be a contaminated area. Work has been done with the schools with an aim of speeding up the evacuation process and a plan has been produced which will enable them to be able to self evacuate with assistance from Sellafield Ltd in terms of supporting the costs of insurance for the schools to enable them to cover that.

202. The Children's services department at Cumbria County Council has looked at the regulations and some of the obstacles that were looked at around booster seats can be overcome in the event of an emergency, as there is clear legislation to cover that.

203. David Humphrey's is working with DECC to clear up one or two little points with regards to nurseries. For the schools, evacuations can be carried out by parents, people don't need to have the enhanced checks that they need in the event of an emergency, all they need is to be known to the school.

204. Mr Moore felt it had been a nationwide problem through emergency planning and the issue had been ongoing for years, but when the schools and the EPSC got together a solution has been reached that the schools are happy with and he believed the area was the first in the country to come up with a solution to the evacuation of school children.

205. LOW LEVEL WASTE SUB COMMITTEE – SUE BROWN

206. Cllr Brown took the report as read, with one edition, she wished to thank Dick Raaz and his team for arranging a beach clean and car park clean (not radiological), providing practical support for community projects and Cllr Brown passed on the thanks of herself and the local residents.

207. COMMERCIAL SUB COMMITTEE – MIKE DAVIDSON

208. A bit of an apology to the committee, this is a draft report still based on draft minutes due to a disconnect between myself and the secretariat.

209. **Martin Forwood:** Yes, just one point, the draft report lists two actions that were supposed to have been taken in respect of questions I had asked. I haven't yet had answers to those.

210. **Mike Davidson:** I will chase that up Martin, my apologies.

211. ITEM 11 – DATE AND VENUES OF NEXT MEETINGS

212. The Chairman concluded the meeting and alerted members that the next event of the WCSSG will be Thursday 7th July 2011 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall and the next scrutiny meeting will be Thursday 6th October 2011 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall.

213. (**Note from secretariat:** Next meeting is now Wednesday 3rd August 2011 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall – and NOT Thursday 7th July)