

**MINUTES OF THE 6th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT WHITEHAVEN CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 3RD APRIL 2008**

Present:

Cllr Allan Holliday	-	Copeland Borough Council
Cllr P Connolly	-	Copeland Borough Council
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Mr J A Clark	-	UKAEA Prospect
Mr Paul Shawcross	-	Prospect
Mr R Hargreaves	-	West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group
Dr J Astbury	-	Health Protection Agency
Mr R Wright	-	Gosforth Parish Council
Mr Ranald Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Mr Norman Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr Mark Foy	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr A Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Prof J Haywood	-	Environmental Health sub committee
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Miss Shirley Williams	-	Secretariat
Mr Neil Longfellow	-	Sellafield Ltd
Mr P Mann	-	UKAEA
Mr Ian Laidlaw	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Cllr M Davidson	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Stewart Kemp	-	Cumbria Country Council
Mr P Daley	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Alan Clark	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr P Kane	-	GMB Union
Mr H Wormstrup	-	Whitehaven Trades Council
Mrs Rosina Robinson	-	WCSSG Secretariat

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the sixth Scrutiny meeting of the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group, he 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. He asked that members sign the register that was circulating around the table.
3. He began by explaining that the WCSSG had been approached by Studsvik and the West Cumbria Business Cluster, who both wished to become members of the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group.

4. Gordon McCullogh from Studsvik and Colin Sharpe from the West Cumbria Business Cluster were both in attendance to observe proceedings.
5. The Chairman felt that given Studsvik is now a nuclear licensed site it could join the committee as advisory members in the same way as Sellafield Ltd and UKAEA and would be held to scrutiny and be expected to produce reports at each meeting. Studsvik had indicated that it is quite happy to do that. The Chairman felt it was right that they join the committee as they hold a site licence in West Cumbria. He asked if any members had any concerns with them becoming members, none of whom did.
6. The Chairman continued with regard to the West Cumbria Business Cluster, the committee would be very interested in knowing how the smaller businesses link in with the Supply Chain and so he felt it was quite important that they also have a seat on the WCSSG. Again members were happy with this.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

7. The Chairman reported that a number of members were unable to attend, some of which had sent along representatives, he welcomed the representatives to the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 04 OCTOBER 07

8. The Chairman asked if there were any amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 04 October 07.
9. Cllr Holliday made one amendment, explaining that he had been excluded from the list of attendees.
10. There were no further amendments.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 5th MEETING

11. There were no matters arising.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – REPORT FROM THE WCSSG CHAIRMAN ON THE RESTRUCTURE OF THE WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP.

12. The Chairman began by explaining that he had given an update at the previous meeting on the way the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group was moving forward.
13. The committee is currently setting up three new sub committees namely the Socio Economic sub committee, the commercial sub committee and the decommissioning sub committee.

14. Since the last report the final meetings had been held by the Windscale sub committee and the Calder Hall sub committee. The chairman passed on his thanks to all members of those committees who had put in a lot of work particularly during the last 12 months with the transition at Windscale and with the demolition of the Calder Hall cooling towers.
15. He continued that both Ranald Stewart and Norman Clarkson had worked extremely hard and they both had a good working committee around them. He thanked them and the committees for the work that they had done and hoped that they could be utilised by the new committees as they both had valuable experience which would be beneficial to those new committees.
16. The new Socio Economic sub committee had already been set up and had held its first meeting on the 7th March 08. The 'note for the record' was completed and is on the WCSSG website. Cllr Elaine Woodburn had been appointed as Chair of the committee and would be presenting a report later at agenda item 15.
17. The Chairman reported a provisional date of 21st April had been allocated for the commercial sub committee. Information and requests for membership had been sent out to all members of the WCSSG. The Chairman asked any parties who are interested in sitting on the sub committee to put their names forward to the secretariat.
18. The first meeting would concentrate on agreeing the terms of reference for the committee. The terms of reference had been sent out to members for all the new committees for comments.
19. The decommissioning sub committee will be arranged sometime in May the date has not yet been confirmed.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – REPORT ON NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY

20. The Chairman invited Ian Laidlaw to present the report.
21. Mr Laidlaw began by explaining that he had worked for the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority since January 05 and had been based at Dounreay for the last two and a half years as the Site Programme Manager. He returned to the NDA core team coming up to a year ago.
22. He reported that he would be moving into the NDA Sellafield site team on Monday 7th April where he would be working under Mr Jim Morse who was taking over the role of Mark Dixon who has now left the NDA.
23. Mr Morse was unable to attend the WCSSG meeting as he was at the NDA board meeting in Hunterston.
24. Mr Laidlaw continued that NDA was busy at the moment with the competition issues, particularly given the recent announcement on the Low Level Waste Repository contract being awarded.

25. On the Sellafield competition NDA is awaiting the tenders and Mr Laidlaw would be spending 50% of his time over the next two months on tender assessment.
26. He reported that the NDA has a new Chairman in post and the NDA has been re-organised into three divisions, Assurance, Finance and Strategy.
27. Mr Laidlaw reported that there have been several publications issued one being the socio economic plan and the business plan was the other. Mr Laidlaw encouraged members to read the business plan for the details as there are some movements within it.
28. Mr Laidlaw explained that NDA is now responsible for International Nuclear Services who has moved across to the NDA.
29. He reported that Windscale as of 1st April had become part of the SLC so there was quite a lot happening.
30. Referring again to the NDA Business Plan, Mr Laidlaw reported that the highlight in it is that roughly £600,000,000 (6 hundred million) more had been allocated for the Sellafield SLC across the next 3 years. This was following NDA's principal that funds follow hazards so the funds will be allocated where the highest hazards are. The two sets of highest hazards are Sellafield and Dounreay.
31. Mr Laidlaw concluded that the NDA had been conducting a market engagement programme in terms of NDA land and who might be interested in it. The NDA is asking people to help with regards to what it does with Plutonium. Options being looked at include looking at reactors and various other issues.
32. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Asked with regards to the restructuring of the management into divisions, Strategy, Commercial, Assurance and Finance; was it assurance and finance or assurance division and finance division?
33. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Confirmed it is Assurance Division and Finance Division.
34. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Asked what the Assurance division does?
35. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Explained that the idea behind it is that the NDA moved to being what it had tried to be from the beginning which is a strategic authority, which would mean it becomes a strategic mind for the overall organisation. You then need another part of it which looks after the money which is finance; you also need another part of it that looks after 'is what we've asked to be done been done and is it being done effectively' which is what assurance is about.
36. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** So it's financial business aspects and targets and achievements and nothing to do with safety?
37. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** responded that safety comes within the assurance directorate also although there is a direct report. Alan Ray has taken over that position from Lawrence Williams. Alan Ray has a direct reporting line to Ian Roxburgh as well so if there are any safety issues it goes straight to Ian.

38. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** What is the structure to look after safety?
39. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Alan Ray looks after what Lawrence used to look after and he has a day to day reporting line to Jim Morse and a direct line reporting to Ian Roxburgh.
40. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Commented that she found it pretty bad of the NDA to send someone who is quite new to the area and who doesn't understand the needs. The date of the meetings are in the calendar of events and are know six months in advance and if the NDA could not send somebody who could go through the presentation with the issues that the committee has facing it, she found it disrespectful of the NDA.
41. **David Moore:** Asked if Ian Laidlaw wanted to respond to the comment or move onto the next question. Mr Laidlaw acknowledged the point and asked to move on.
42. **Q: Joe Clark:** With regards to the West Cumbria community fund being established, he asked for some details as to who contributes to the fund and how it is set up and run. Although he is a stakeholder group member and on the Socio economic sub committee, he had not heard of this community fund?
43. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Was unable to answer the question and offered to come back to Mr Clark with the answer.
44. **A: David Moore:** Clarified that the community fund Mr Clark was referring to was the fund that is linked to the Low Level Waste Repository at Drigg. He thought the title was slightly misleading however. The Chairman explained that there would be further information available following a meeting that was scheduled to take place the following day which both he and Elaine Woodburn would be attending as representatives of the Council. At that meeting they hope to be able to thrash out the details which would enable them to give people more information on it.
45. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** referring to the NDA Socio Economic plan and referring to page 12 (support to the local supply chain). The way that Mr Wormstrup interpreted the paragraph was that in his opinion it is trying to encourage the local supply chain to diverse away from the Nuclear Industry. In view of the fact that in this area there is only the nuclear industry left, he asked if this was the death knell to the local supply industry?
46. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** responded that it was very much not given the length of programme that still exists at Sellafield. He did refer to the fact that the plan is written taking all of the other sites into consideration also including sites that are going to be running down over the next ten to fifteen years and local supply basis in those areas need to think about what they are going to do for the future.
47. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** Can you confirm that the NDA said it was not the death knell and would supply the local supply chain network?

48. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Responded that the supply chain network is supported through what the site spends. And NDA would be looking at over a billion pound of spends on the Sellafield site this year and for the next couple of years.
49. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** asked how much of that billion of pounds of spends had been or would be spent locally?
50. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Responded that the question should be directed to the site.
51. **David Moore:** Asked for the information to be sent via the WCSSG secretariat in order for it to be circulated to all members.
52. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Commented that there was no presentation from International Nuclear Services on the agenda and commented that it was something that he had fought for over the last couple of years to try and get onto this committee. He asked given that INS has now gone into the NDA whether the NDA was going to make arrangements for this committee to be given some kind of a shipping update at every meeting?
53. **A: Ian Laidlaw:** Responded that INS had just transferred over to the NDA and as such he wasn't sure what the position was but felt sure it could be provided.
54. **A: David Moore:** Asked if we could ensure that in future that report could come from the NDA (**note from secretariat:** - arrangements had already been made for INS to report on transport issues at the new Commercial sub committee, first meeting scheduled for 21st April).
55. **Q: Tim Knowles:** Expressed concern that the NDA was treating the WCSSG with a level of contempt, in terms of the ability of its representative to answer questions. He commented that at a recent County Council nuclear issues working group meeting, members had received a presentation from the NDA with a similar lack of understanding and detailed knowledge from the representative in attendance. He continued that the WCSSG is supposed to be the lead stakeholder communication mechanism for the NDA with the West Cumbrian community and given the situation at the moment with a PBO announcement at the LLW repository having just been made and coming to the end of an unsatisfactory process from a stakeholder point of view with the Sellafield PBO process he was appalled by the inadequate NDA report and the lack of ability to answer any detailed questions. He felt that it was unacceptable and needed to be taken up by the local authorities formally.
56. **David Moore:** Thank Mr Knowles for his comments and stated that the NDA had well noted the comments that had been made during the meeting. He continued that hopefully in future the committee would receive a more detailed report and perhaps a full team could be fielded so that the NDA could answer the full range of questions.
57. **AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM SELLAFIELD LTD**
58. The Chairman invited Neil Longfellow to present the Sellafield Ltd report. Neil began by explaining that he is the deputy managing director at the Sellafield Site

and he was representing Barry Snelson who had sent his apologies as he was otherwise engaged in London meeting the WANO president.

59. He took the report as read and intended to highlight a few key issues and take any questions.
60. Mr Longfellow began with operational performance and recognised that the report had been issued a couple of weeks before the end of the financial year. The Sellafield MOX plant is in operation, and is making fuel for a German customer. Currently Sellafield Ltd is carrying out a physical inventory take for its regulators DGTREN. Upon completion of the inventory take, the plant will be available for operation. Good progress has been made in the production of pellets but rod manufacture remains the bottleneck in the plant and overall production has fallen behind due to the issue in rod manufacturing. Although there have been a number of successful improvements, there is still work to do to achieve the desired output in the rod area. Sellafield Ltd is working closely with the NDA to determine a satisfactory way forward.
61. Magnox Reprocessing ran down at the beginning of February to allow commencement of the Physical Inventory take, again for the regulators DGTREN and to carry out some minor outage activities. Although there were a number of issues that prevented re-start on the planned date which included problems with the combined heat and power plant at Sellafield these have all now been resolved and the plant is now currently operational.
62. In Thorp, shearing recommenced on 28th January in agreement with Sellafield Ltd's regulators and the NDA, however during the first cycle of the dissolver batch campaign a wire rope on the elevator system failed whilst transferring the final four AGR cans from the feed pond to the shear cave. The fuel laden elevator carriage as designed rolled back into the feed pond under gravity and was stopped by the shock absorbers. An investigation has been carried out and the reason why the wire rope failed at the time has been determined and a report will be issued very shortly. The plant has all been recovered successfully, the ropes have been replaced, the new shock absorbers have been fitted and Thorp restarted shearing on Sunday 16th March.
63. In terms of the Vitrification plant, currently line one is in outage, line two and three are running. The total output for the year is below the annual target figure due to plant breakdowns and steam supply issues. The decision to bring forward the glass frit feed system work on line three further reduced plant availability but Mr Longfellow reported that this was justified on risk reduction grounds and a potential to input learning to projects that require similar repairs to lines one and two.
64. The first half of 2008/09 will see engineering outages on lines one and two for major asset care work, this work is essential to maintain the long term availability of the Windscale Vitrification Plant (WVP) and to avoid as much as possible unplanned outages due to plant failures.
65. Mr Longfellow continued that in terms of the Highly active evaporators on site during the past six months availability of the HA evaporative capacity in HALES

has not constrained Magnox Reprocessing, Sellafield Ltd has been operating Evaporator C on those liquors.

66. The licence instrument application to operator Evaporator A on WVP effluents following engineering and modifications was submitted to the NII in November. Sellafield Ltd received the licence instrument on 31st March 08.
67. Progress on the engineering and modifications to Evaporator B has continued, the revised safety case for Evaporator B has also been submitted to the NII with the expectation that the evaporator will return to service processing Magnox liquors towards the end of the first quarter of this financial year.
68. The new Evaporator D project continues to make progress, steel manufacturing is nearing completion and the contract with the Evaporator body manufacturer is placed.
69. Also in High Level Waste Plants, the other main project is the Residues Export Facility (REF), which is very important for returning vitrified waste to the overseas customer, Sellafield Ltd is now preparing for active commissioning of that facility.
70. Mr Longfellow reported that the Combined Heat and Power Plant, the fell side gas power station that generates electricity for the national grid and supplies steam for processes and heating at Sellafield, is a very important facility. On 4th February the extraction stack to one of the fell side three turbine units was noticed to be leaning slightly. A full inspection over the following days showed that corrosion was present in all three extraction stacks. The stacks needed to be repaired and taken down, therefore the operating plants progressively shut down to a quiescent state over the 8th and 9th February so that the demand for steam was well within the capability of the fell side's back up boiler. All three stacks were safely dismantled and removed by 16th February leaving shorter 6m sections in place. Following evaluation of a range of solutions, the Environment Agency gave interim approval for the plant to operate with shortened stacks. Mr Longfellow confirmed that it would take a number of months for fell side operating company to complete a permanent repair to fellside. In the interim period, the fellside operations will be optimised to minimise emissions.
71. Moving onto clean up, Mr Longfellow reported that Mr Tony Price had left Sellafield Ltd and took up a new role. Mr Peter Lutwyche who was the head of Strategy directorate as of September has taken up the position of Director of Nuclear Decommissioning and Major Project group and is leading the programme forward.
72. Highlighting some of the key decommissioning accomplishments, Mr Longfellow reported that the contents of B204 HANO cell are now fully stabilised, which has been a significant project and has mitigated one of Sellafield's major hazards on its risk register. A specially customised laser scanner was used to generate a highly accurate 3D image, then 700m³ of a specially formulated foam grout was deployed, stabilising all in-cell inventory. With a dry density of around 500kg/m³, the grout has a bubble texture which can be easily crushed to a quarter of its size upon removal. It is not in the same

density of ordinary grout therefore it is easily removed, but it has stabilised the cell.

73. A number of challenging 'tie-ins' was completed on the Separation Area Ventilation Project, which will enable the diversion of aerial effluents currently routed to historic stacks nearing the end of their operational lives to a new discharge facility which will meet current and future operational and decommissioning needs, Mr Longfellow reported this was another significant step forward in terms of clean up.
74. In building 29 the pond sludge corral has been lifted into the pond, to ultimately enable the washing of the skips and recovery of sludge from the pond floor, again another major step.
75. There has been some demolition of the old occupational health buildings to base slab level, with the majority of waste going to be recycled with minimal disruption to site personnel or operations reducing the skyline at Sellafield.
76. Mr Longfellow reported that the external structure was completed on the Sellafield Product Residue store with the final concrete roof pour at the end of October. Since then the work inside the building has continued with the first modules being lifted into the building.
77. Referring to EPS3, substantial progress has been made including the start of retaining wall construction of the North side of street 120, casting of 36 nine tonne service trench protection slabs and completion of piling for the tower crane foundation. Mr Longfellow reported that this was again another major step on another important waste store for the Sellafield site.
78. Moving on to report on safety Mr Longfellow commented that nuclear safety remains Sellafield Ltd's priority and a strategic direction for the site has been established. The drive to enhance nuclear safety has been assisted by membership and commitment to WANO, the World Association of Nuclear Operators, by increasing learning from other nuclear establishments and Sellafield's participation in peer reviews across the world.
79. Site inspections have indicated improvements in nuclear safety awareness and profile across the site which Mr Longfellow believed was very positive.
80. Alongside the significant improvements, it was reported that there have been four events during the previous six months classified as level 1 anomaly on the International Nuclear Event Scale taking the total to six events for the financial year against a base target of seven.
81. The four recorded events included a fault not assessed in the safety case, a high level trip not installed as required in the safety case, a contaminated puncture wound and plant maintenance not being carried out on a shutdown piece of equipment.
82. A number of environmental initiatives are ongoing including an Environmental Vision with underlying strategies focussing upon the supply chain, energy, waste

hierarchy and company transport. Notwithstanding the recent initiatives a warning letter has been received from the Environment Agency regarding a breach of the Fuel Handling Plant caesium-137 aerial limit in 2006; the management of reporting and follow-up to the event was noted as exemplary by the Environment Agency.

83. Mr Longfellow reported that minor injuries such as slips, trips and falls continue to dominate Sellafield's conventional safety performance, there are however, areas of good practice across the site with the Sellafield Product and Residue Store notably having worked more than a million man hours without a lost time accident, a significant success for that facility and that construction team. Mr Longfellow went on to say that this project previously accounted for the majority of contractor accidents and this turnaround has been attributed to improved workforce understanding of risks, management supervision and leadership.
84. In terms of socio economic impacts, Sellafield Ltd has been working very closely with the local supply chain and continues to support the work of the development agencies in assisting local suppliers to be successful in winning work in the nuclear sector. The latest supplier forum was held in November at the Sellafield Visitors Centre and the next is on April 22nd. Sellafield Ltd has also held the first ever knowledge market at the Sellafield Visitors Centre which was hailed as a huge success by all involved. It resulted in a number of new contracts being made across the supply chain, but Mr Longfellow reported he felt it could have benefited from more local suppliers being present and would like to encourage that for the next one.
85. The Sellafield Visitors Centre is changing focus with the emphasis on its role as a Business Centre, offering and promoting its use to external organisations and businesses, including an office for use by the West Cumbria Business Cluster who has over 100 members. The Supply Chain Ombudsman, whose role is unique in the nuclear industry and not only includes issue resolution, but promotion of improved communication and engagement with the supply chain, also has an office in the Business Centre.
86. In terms of Sellafield Ltd's forward programme, over the next six months the major challenge will be the transition to a new parent body organisation taking over the contract to deliver the scope of work on the Sellafield site. Mr Longfellow stated that the site is working very hard to make this a smooth and safe transition.
87. To date Sellafield Ltd has successfully delivered the LLWR transition (4 months ahead of schedule), British Nuclear Group wind up/BNFL run down, Nexia transition, Windscale transition (Mr Longfellow extended a warm welcome to Peter Mann and his team) and INS transfer to NDA.
88. In conclusion, Mr Longfellow stated that the site has a good record of managing change and he hoped to continue during this difficult period in terms of the transition from a major site at Sellafield into a new parent body organisation. The site will continue to focus on safety as its number one priority.

89. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Referring to page 10 of the Sellafield Ltd report stated that the new director of police is not in fact a policeman. He stated that he found that a little bit worrying and hoped it wasn't a sign that we have moved from the UKAEA constabulary which was a dedicated constabulary to the Civil Nuclear Police. He hoped it wasn't another stage on the movement towards reducing the level and quality of policing on the site and throughout the nuclear industry but particularly on the Sellafield site?
90. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that he didn't personally know the gentleman, but he didn't believe it would be a reduction in Sellafield Ltd's approach to policing and security on the site at all. He thought the infrastructure associated with security was very strong and robust and he felt hopeful that the gentleman would lead it as well as the previous role holder.
91. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Re-iterated that it seemed a bit odd to have a man who isn't a policeman in charge of a really important police force?
92. **A: Shirley Williams:** Suggested if there was a concern about that issue that a representative could be invited to come to the next meeting?
93. **David Moore:** Pointed out that they are invited anyway as members of the committee and it would be quite useful if members did attend especially if there are items on the agenda that people want to question them on.
94. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** commented that it was very heartening to see that in the zero event workplace initiative Sellafield Ltd had achieved 500,000 man hours without a single event or lost time accident. He congratulated the site for its achievements and hoped it would role out across the site.
95. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Wished to raise a point which could be officially recorded at the meeting. He continued that the Sellafield Visitors Centre is changing focus with emphasis on its role as a business centre, which was referred to on page 11 of the Sellafield Ltd report. He continued that the Company actually paid numerous agency supplied workers off which resulted in the PLC employees who were prospect members losing money through re-organisation in order to create a business centre. Mr Shawcross felt that business means jobs. On the same page of the report it is referring to employment and economic diversification regarding investing money in West Cumbria. To him it reads that Sellafield Ltd has paid some people off and with the money it has generated it has created a platform to create some jobs. He found that bizarre.
96. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** commended Mr Longfellow for the work relating to the local supply chain network, pre-NDA and up to the present moment in time. He had attended the knowledge market and the Sellafield Ltd report had been accurate in its description of the event. Mr Wormstrup was concerned however about the impact to Sellafield Ltd when its paymaster, the NDA dictates it has to be less reliant on the supply chain (page 12 - NDA socio economic plan).
97. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that as Ian Laidlaw had pointed out earlier the NDA socio economic plan covers all of the NDA's portfolio. He continued that Sellafield Ltd would always look to support the local supply chain the best it

possibly could but it has to remain competitive in that. He thought that the encouragement in the supply chain should be that the local supply chain is competitive against national and that will therefore mean that they can win as many contracts as they won before. It is all about competition Sellafield Ltd's duty is to the UK tax payer and its duty is to ensure that the best contracts are placed in the most economic way. Mr Longfellow believed that the West Cumbria supply chain and the broader local supply chain was very well positioned to continue on with that and Sellafield Ltd and hopefully the new PBO would continue to support that very much.

98. **Cllr A Clark:** Stated that with regard to Thorp and reprocessing, the Secretary of State had announced that the Government was going to stop reprocessing at Sellafield. There had just been the good news that the NDA is going to spend 600 million extra. He asked that if the Government and Sellafield curtailed reprocessing how many jobs would it cost? He continued that compensation is no good for the loss of the jobs because there are children leaving school who will have nowhere to apply for a job and he was concerned that if six or seven thousand jobs disappear, children leaving school won't get jobs, they need to leave school and have somewhere to go and he felt there should be some hard facts and figures of how many jobs are going to go if reprocessing stopped. He also asked how many jobs would be created if two new power stations were built. He thought there were people who would think getting two new power stations would solve the problem. Cllr Clarke stated that it would not solve the problem, it would maybe create 300 jobs in each one. He re-iterated that hard facts were needed?
99. **A: David Moore:** Thanked Councillor Clarke for his comments and noted them. He continued that he had not actually heard that the Government was going to stop reprocessing. He stated that at this stage there will be no further contracts actively sought for reprocessing and as a community Copeland had clearly said on many occasions that reprocessing is something that the community would support in the area and would encourage. He felt that the opportunities come through the consultations on new build and that it had been made quite clear that the community would like to talk about reprocessing as part of that.
100. **Q: Cllr A Clark:** Responded that the communities may want reprocessing to last forever but that won't necessarily mean that it will.
101. **A: David Moore:** Responded that the Community is actively lobbying and would continue to do so. Government will make the decisions it makes and does say that it is open to views via consultation. Mr Moore thought Government would be very foolish to ignore the views that come out of West Cumbria on any issues especially with regard to where we may be moving to as the year goes on. With regard to the socio economic side there was now the socio economic sub committee where these issues could be looked at. Mr Moore reported that the committee was looking to commission some work on putting together some real figures of what the economic face of West Cumbria might look like if things like reprocessing stopped and was trying to get some facts. The figures currently worked to tend to be the old figures that were in the ERM report. He understood the NDA was funding the report. David Moore told Cllr Clarke that he would be more than welcome to become a member of the socio economic sub committee.

102. **Cllr A Clark:** Concluded that in his opinion there was a catastrophe waiting to happen in terms of loosing 6,000 to 8,000 jobs in West Cumbria.
103. **Q: Mike Davidson:** Referred to page 3 of the Sellafield Ltd report relevant to Evaporator D and noted with interest that the steel is almost ready and the programme is moving ahead. He asked if there was any intention to use facilities in the port of Workington to transport the equipment and if so can Sellafield Ltd communicate with the port fairly rapidly as the port is deeply involved with the Robin Rigg operation and is utilising a lot of its lay down area for that?
104. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that he didn't have the exact details in terms of actual detail. But it was his understanding that Sellafield Ltd would be looking to use Workington port for the import of some of the material. He endeavoured to source the answer through the project team, he also knew that the project team had been liaising but he didn't have the exact details associated with that.
105. **Q: Joe Clark:** Referred to page 11 of the Sellafield Ltd report in which it stated that the life time plan scope was significantly greater than the funding available. He knew that part of that scope relates to specifications imposed by the NII relating to real risk on the Sellafield site. He asked what has got to give?
106. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that the report was correct in terms of its analysis. Principally what was within the life time plan was an accelerated programme particularly in the decommissioning areas, so all the operational areas and infrastructure areas were funded and the decommissioning programme itself which includes the specifications at an accelerated position. With the current funding awarded from the NDA for this year and for the next two years under the CSR some of that acceleration will have to slow down and a review is being carried out looking at whether Sellafield Ltd can meet those specifications with the current level of funding. There will be some areas that will have to slow down associated with that current level of funding and that is what Sellafield Ltd is working on with respect to the life time plan submission.
107. **Q: Joe Clarke:** asked what powers the regulators have in relation to funding. If the regulators identified a genuine risk and demanded that something is done with that risk then how can we say because of commercial constraints we can't deal with the risk?
108. **A: Mark Foy:** Responded that NII was aware of the funding discrepancies at the moment between the plan that has been prepared by Sellafield Ltd and the monies available. There is a holding position at this moment in time where Sellafield Ltd is required to re-visit the life time plan and the work set out within it. Following which Sellafield Ltd need to then inform the regulators of exactly what the implications are in terms of the specifications that NII puts in place re: safety etc. So currently, the impact of the funding is not fully know, but once the life time plan is fully worked up it will become more apparent and the NII will have to consider what action may be necessary at some stage in the future.
109. **Q: Joe Clark:** Responded that the impact of the life time plan may not yet be fully known, but we appear to fully know some of the risks that are there. He

commented that Sellafield Ltd is culpable knowing that these risks are there and yet while funding is being sorted out nothing is being done about them.

110. **Q: Neil Longfellow:** responded that in context of the current funding the priority of the risks at Sellafield are managed through the risk register and through appropriate funding driven to the key risks, safety is maintained at the highest level possible. When he had said that some of the projects may not be accelerated none of those are the high hazard ones. Appropriate funding should be available for the ones that are high hazard, and that is what Sellafield Ltd is reviewing. Some of the older projects, the buildings that are relatively quiescent and do not particularly need accelerated decommissioning will remain in that state as on other nuclear sites around the NDA's portfolio.
111. **Q: Richard Wright:** Referred to the failure of wire ropes in Thorp and stated that it was an 'eye opener' for him. In his experience to do with mining in a third world country (Ghana) deep level mining when men's lives depended on wire ropes that didn't fail, they were serviced, they were sampled the ends were checked they were replaced on an absolute schedule. He presumed also that in Switzerland on the ski slopes wire ropes don't fail. It didn't leave him with a great of confidence.
112. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that the wire ropes within the Sellafield pond were well within their inspection date which is independently carried out by Zurich and Sellafield Ltd's own experts. The operation of moving the elevator from top to bottom even without fuel was routinely done whilst the plant was in a quiescent state awaiting restart. The visual inspection of the ropes through the windows and through the pond was fine when the elevator went up. The system is designed to allow for this type of failure holding the elevator full of fuel and that was exactly what happened. He did agree however that the inspection period was most probably not appropriate and it was maybe accelerated by the fact that the plant had stood for a period of time and therefore behaved differently to a normal operation. That recommendation out of the review had been implemented across the site and the periodicity of inspection and the periodicity of when the ropes will be changed will be reduced significantly ensuring more inspections and routine checks.
113. **David Moore:** Referred back to the Visitors Centre, stating that it had raised some concerns with a great deal of members of the public. The fact that the business centre is taking off and going to be used to develop business was an excellent initiative and hopefully it would start to generate a little bit of income which perhaps could be invested back. He thought that numbers of visitors had fallen in the Visitors Centre because there has been no investment recently in it. He thought it was looking a bit old and tired and in need of some re-investment. He continued that it has proved a catalyst to bringing a lot of people into West Cumbria who could then see what other attractions were available. He thought it was a valuable tool, and rather than seeing the running down of the Visitors Centre side, if the business centre side was successful there could be money generated and hopefully re-invested back into the Visitors Centre to improve it as an attraction and to bring people into West Cumbria.

114. **Q: Martin Forwood:** With regards to the MOX plant, Mr Longfellow had mentioned pellet reduction and a bottle neck with the fuel rods. He asked whether there had been any assemblies made yet for the sites German customer?
115. **A: Neil Longfellow:** confirmed that there had been no assemblies made. He confirmed that Sellafield Ltd had made just over 4 tonnes of pellets for the customer and about 1000 rods before the outage. Sellafield Ltd has enough rods to make two fuel assemblies but don't anticipate making any fuel assemblies for a month or two yet. Mr Longfellow reported that he wanted to get the rod system working from the latest outage and then it will be determined exactly the plan forward from there. He re-iterated 4.2 tonnes of pellets, around 1000 rods and no fuel assemblies and confirmed the plan is to do 16 fuel assemblies for a March 09 delivery to Germany.
116. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Referred to the Vitrification Plant. In the report it stated that lines one and two will be out on an engineering outage for the first half of the coming year. He asked what kind of target Sellafield is aiming for in total.
117. **A: Neil Longfellow:** In terms of the output for last year Sellafield Ltd produced 314 containers against what was a base target of 450. The target for 08/09 is 340 containers to be made.
118. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Relating to Thorp and evaporator C and the figure of 300 tonnes. Mr Forwood wasn't totally clear what it all meant, he asked if he was saying that if there is only evaporator C in use, Thorp could do 300 tonnes on evaporator C only and if that was the case is that 300 tonnes over 12 months or 6 months.
119. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that it is quite complex and often quite difficult to explain in writing but in very simple terms only evaporator C can operator on oxide liquors so evaporators A and B do not treat oxide liquors. The case for evaporator C is based on the thickness of the base of the evaporator so therefore you have got to take into account that evaporator C will operate on Magnox liquors and oxide liquors, therefore you get an allocated amount of base thickness for Thorp processing. This year because there is the Medium Active salt free evaporator installation in Thorp which will take a 16 week period Thorp has been allocated 300 tonnes for this year of evaporator C base, so can process 300 tonnes of oxide liquor through evaporator C. If for example evaporator B is put back on line successfully and processes Magnox liquor you will get more capability in the Thorp oxide liquor, therefore the 300 tonnes is this year. If the plan goes forward with respect to evaporator A, B and C, currently there is around 1500 tonnes of Thorp capacity in evaporator C alone which includes Magnox reprocessing, therefore we will be looking at a batch figure each year associated with Thorp reprocessing. For this year it is intended which includes the 50 tonnes we have just finished, 300 tonnes, next year we will again be looking to say well is it 300 tonnes, is it 400 tonnes is it 500 tonnes, but it will be allocated on the performance associated with Magnox reprocessing and evaporator B licensing.

120. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Re: the Residue export facility and the return of high level wastes. He had never come across the phrase pseudo-active phase, is this some new regulator phase?
121. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Responded that the facility is not active but to prepare people for active operations it is treated as active. People change over barriers, put the correct PPE on etc. This is to enable the process operators and the mechanical and electrical fitters to get used to treating the plant as an active plant. So pseudo active commissioning is preparation for all the people and all the PPE and it is standard practice.
122. **Q: Martin Forwood:** The reason behind my question is that reading between the lines, what you are saying is that you are not as close to actually returning the first shipment of high level waste as you were this time last year and that's really confirmed by the NDA's business plan, because the difference between their draft business plan and the actual business plan, the return of waste has certainly been downgraded time wise?
123. **A: Neil Longfellow:** thought that was a very fair comment. He continued that it isn't just the residue export facility and the availability of it that is the problem. There are flask issues, transport issues and customer issues and they all add up to a delay in that return, which in his opinion won't be significant. There are a number of things to resolve before the material can be returned and with it being the first one it is important to get it right. It is very challenging as a programme, it isn't just about Sellafield site, it is about the transport and it is about what the customers want. The customer also has to have a window where it can accept it and that is not always easily available.
124. **Q: Martin Forward:** asked where the report mentions security it refers to the threat level remaining at severe and heightened. Mr Forwood wondered if at the current threat level, why Sellafield Ltd should want to be about to make the first of four plutonium shipments to Europe given that it is obviously a very contentious cargo, something that terrorists would very much like to get their hands on?
125. **A: Neil Longfellow:** Did not wish to speak too much about Plutonium shipments in terms of timing. The security level is determined by OCNS, severe and heightened is appropriated by many different aspects of the threat level and it is not necessarily around the movement of material on or off site, it is particular to the current situation. In terms of the shipment of material Sellafield Ltd is planning to move the material and that is still the intent and it should be and hopefully is a guarded secret as to when that material does move, but it does cover all the relevant security arrangements that the UK Government imposes upon them.
126. **Q: Martin Forwood:** commented that the information about transport movements is not secret, people do know about them well in advance.
127. **A: Neil Longfellow:** replied that there is advanced notice of when a type 1 material shipment goes ahead but there is certainly no absolute details of when it is.

128. **Q: Cllr A Clark:** responded that with regard to the concern of the shipments, he was glad it was returning overseas. He thought CORE would be pleased that it was going elsewhere. He felt it was right and proper that it is dispatched back to where it originated.
129. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** pointed out that he was concerned about discussing secret security arrangements for highly volatile material. He felt Martin Forwood was quite right to have concerns about it but it is something that can't be talked about in public. He continued that Martin was quite right to say that it could be a target for terrorists, but he was quite sure that both Sellafield and the Government would ensure that public safety is paramount. He re-iterated he did not like to hear it talked about in public.
- 130. AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM UKAEA**
131. The Chairman asked Peter Mann to present the report. Peter reported that this would be the last UKAEA report to the WCSSG and the activities at Windscale would be scrutinised in future by the Decommissioning sub committee.
132. He reported that the transfer of the Windscale site was achieved as planned on 1st April with the new site licence being granted to Sellafield Ltd for the Windscale site by the NII. The combined discharge authorisation for Windscale and Sellafield being granted by the Environment Agency and the Office of Civil Nuclear Security also approving a revised security plan.
133. Mr Mann thought that the whole project which was pretty complex was conducted in a very professional and good humoured way and this had been a great example of team working between the people of Windscale and Sellafield and he believed that provided an excellent foundation for the integrated working of the sites into the future.
134. On the 1st April most of the staff transferred to become employees of Sellafield Ltd and all contracts in the supply chain were transferred such that operations on the site continued without interruption.
135. Talking of the historical aspects of UKAEA, Mr Mann commented that the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority has been the operator of the Windscale site for the last 54 years so it really is the end of an era. However it is also a new beginning for UKAEA with the formation of a new group structure. In preparing for the restructuring, UKAEA has been operating a divisional structure including a business division which has now become UKAEA Ltd, this organisation will continue to trade as UKAEA and a resource enhancement contract to support the Windscale programme through the provision of a small number of people to fill some of the key roles on the site. Mr Mann believed this will be the basis of a successful partnership between UKAEA and Sellafield for the future.
136. In other parts of the industry UKAEA will hold the contract with the NDA to manage the decommissioning at Dounreay. At Dounreay a licence was granted to the newly formed company, Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd on 1st April 08. The organisation will continue to manage the decommissioning programme at

Harwell in Oxfordshire and Winfrith in Dorset and when re-licensing takes place later in the year, Harwell and Winfrith will become a single body which will become known as Research Sites Restoration Ltd and that will also become a wholly owned subsidiary of UKAEA Ltd alongside the Dounreay company. UKAEA will also continue to lead the UK's fusion research programme at Culham in Oxfordshire.

137. Mr Mann thought that throughout its history UKAEA has shown an ability to respond to the changing environment of the industry and has continued to play a role central to the development of nuclear energy and the nuclear industry. Mr Mann commented that the latest changes mark the latest example of the company's determination to continue that tradition.
138. Moving on to discuss work on the site over the last year, Mr Mann reported that it has been a very successful year for the UKAEA team at Windscale. The site has had its best ever year in terms of its safety performance it has achieved all its environmental milestones, met all its project milestones for the year and expects to finish the year having completed 99% of the work in the plan. Mr Mann reported that had been done at around 10% less than the estimated cost, which meant UKAEA has been able to undertake around 4 million pounds worth of extra work for the NDA at no additional cost.
139. Drawing the committees attention to one or two of the specific achievements, Mr Mann reported that just last week, the team working on the Advanced Gas Cooled reactor completed a campaign by remotely removing the last piece of steel in the reactor pressure vessel barrel, this was a remarkable turnaround following a series of equipment failures and delays earlier in the year.
140. The Piles team had a pretty significant year; it recently completed a second set of camera surveys passing right through the area damaged by the fire in 1957. The work in the first survey together with the work on the prototype machine for fuel removal helped UKAEA enormously when it met with the local, national and international media back in October 07 at the time of the 50th anniversary of the fire. Mr Mann reported that the net result of all of that work was a very well balanced coverage right across the media.
141. In another part of the site, work in conjunction with their colleagues in Nexia has helped UKAEA to develop a comprehensive strategic plan for the shielded examination facilities there and UKAEA has already achieved some key successes in returning that plant to a fully functional state.
142. With regard to people in support roles, Mr Mann stated that a number of those people behind the scenes aren't always recognised as part of the high profile successes that there are on the site and he'd already mentioned the excellent safety and project performance, but the team he thought could be particularly proud this year that it has achieved all those things whilst managing a very complex transition project. Mr Mann felt that the work had a great deal of potential to disrupt activities to take staff's eye off the ball and he was pleased to say that there has been absolutely no evidence that that has been the affect of the work.

143. Looking ahead briefly, Mr Mann reported that UKAEA has submitted its life time plan to the NDA and is currently working with colleagues at Sellafield to agree the milestones and targets for this current year. An important principal in doing that is that incentives for all the parties involved UKAEA, Sellafield and the staff organisations will be fully and properly aligned.
144. Through all the changes that have happened, Mr Mann could assure members that the site had maintained focus on safety, and had been pursuing a process of minimum change to this first stage in transition and Mr Mann believed that has been very valuable in providing maximum stability and certainty for staff through the period of change. Windscale will now work very closely with its colleagues at Sellafield to evaluate further opportunities for integration and that is specifically looking at those on the basis of where they bring a benefit to the business. As part of that Sellafield Ltd may in due course seek a unified licence for Windscale and Sellafield, but all those potential changes and further benefits will be evaluated and then further work will be undertaken. Mr Mann foreseen a very successful future for the Windscale team within Sellafield and thanked Neil Longfellow for the welcome that he and his colleagues had offered them.
145. **David Moore:** David thanked Mr Mann for his commitment to the committee and the sub groups that he had been involved with over the last few years stating that it had been a welcome, open contribution that Mr Mann had made which is how he liked to see the stakeholder groups running. He looked forward to working with Mr Mann on the new decommissioning sub committee.
146. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** stated that UKAEA had a good track record of putting resources into the local community, and asked whether that would still continue?
147. **A: Peter Mann:** Responded that he would be working with colleagues at Sellafield Ltd to understand how best to achieve that. As UKAEA is no longer the site operator it doesn't have a fund for that. Some of the contributions had not been monitory contributions but had been support activities and he certainly intended to continue with those as best he could.

148. **ITEM 8 – REPORT FROM THE NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS INSPECTORATE**

149. The Chairman introduced Mark Foy to present the NII report. Mr Foy began with a basic introduction. He was appointed on 1st January as the nominated site inspector taking over from Steve Lewis. He is not new to the Sellafield site as his previous roles have included some time as a site inspector for Magnox products finishing and storage and effluent encapsulation plants and he has also undertaken assessment work of Sellafield.
150. Mr Foy referred to the safety performance indicators (SPI's) part of the NII report, and reported that this relates to an initiative that has been taken forward by NII across the Nuclear industry in the UK, where it is asking all the licensees to develop metrics that NII can use as indicators to their safety performance. NII has worked with each of the licensees to try an ensure that this is done and put in place and to this end as reported in the quarter 4 report for 2007 NII did agree a set of pilot SPI's with Sellafield during the latter part of 2007. He noted his

disappointment however that Sellafield has not been able to provide any data to the regulator in this area which would indicate its safety performance and NII will be looking to work with Sellafield to ensure that the situation is resolved as soon as possible to try and get that information.

151. Turning to the operational areas at Sellafield, Mr Foy reported that the significance of developing the Safety performance Indicators was underlined during some of the initial stages of Sellafield's work in the area where some of the data that they had gathered highlighted that a significant number of activities on the plant maintenance schedule for HALES, the Highly Active Liquor Evaporation storage facilities was overdue. This is of real concern to NII because the plant maintenance schedule work is required to ensure that all plants that affect safety receive regular systematic examination inspection maintenance and testing so with it not being undertaken there are safety concerns there.
152. As a result of this NII required Sellafield to produce a justification as to why it was safe to continue operating the plant in this area. This was subsequently provided by Sellafield and it was to NII's satisfaction so that operations could continue. NII also halted any further permission activities in this area pending the licensee's investigation and its own regulatory investigation. Mr Foy confirmed that compliance with the plant maintenance schedules has been restored and that was done by mid December 07 and no equipment failures were identified during the restoration to the plant maintenance schedule requirements.
153. The licensee's investigation is completed and NII's investigation as a regulator is nearing completion but NII is still determining the degree of enforcement action that it is going to take. NII has also lifted the moratorium on permissioning within the operating unit so that permissioning will now move forward as normal.
154. In terms of the evaporators, as Neil Longfellow had already stated Mr Foy reported that the licence instrument for evaporator A was issued on 31st March. NII is continuing with its assessment of the submission made by the licensee with regards to evaporator B. Evaporation C is currently operating under existing permissions.
155. Moving to report on physical improvements to safety on the site, Mr Foy stated that Magnox product finishing and storage area is now progressing with the installation of a permanent neutron monitoring system which was something that NII was keen to see taking place in relation to giving defence in depth against inadvertent accumulation of fissile material within the process line. NII has had recent meetings with the licensee and following a difficult period establishing the details and the design of the permanent engineered system it is now coming to fruition and Sellafield Ltd is looking to run the engineered system in parallel with the current interim system during a period of proving, such that by the end of the year they will be able to then move over to a robust permanent engineered protection system that looks at protecting against inadvertent accumulation of fissile material.
156. The NII report that had been submitted identified Sellafield's desire to reprocess the 300 tonnes of irradiated fuel through Thorp and this was started early in

2008. As already reported Mr Foy confirmed that an incident did occur where two ropes failed in the elevator and that prevented fuel transfer from the ponds to the shear caves. This has been investigated by Sellafield and NII and the route cause was identified as a risk based inspection regime that was implemented on the ropes. Mr Foy did not wish to go into any more details other than to say that further details will be provided in the quarter 1 report for 2008. Mr Foy did stress however that NII had satisfied itself that it was safe for Sellafield to go forward and restart reprocessing. There are obvious concerns about the adequacy of risk based inspection activities across the whole of the site and NII will be pursuing this in the short to medium term.

157. With regards to the CHP stacks, NII was advised by the site in the early part of 2008 in respect of corrosion and cracking that was evident on the stacks for the fellside plant and along with the Environment Agency and the site licence company NII was involved in discussions that took place to agree a solution to the issue in terms of provision of steam to the site. NII is now content that the steam is provided to the site by the reduced height stacks but will be pushing to looking at diversity in steam supply to the site.
158. Mr Foy reported that in terms of the transitions, NII has been closely involved with the Windscale transition and the new licence was issued to Sellafield Ltd for the Windscale site on 1st April 08. That was the culmination of a good co-ordinated effort from Sellafield, UKAEA, the NDA, and the regulators, EA, NII and OCNS.
159. In terms of the PBO transition NII has looked to try and reinforce and support the existing executive within Sellafield Ltd and to this end, regulators influence had lead to non executive directors being appointed to the Sellafield executive to give some stability and support at this time of change.
160. Also, a Sellafield transition senior regulatory review group has been set up where representatives of all the various organisations such as Barry Snelson from Sellafield Ltd, Ian Roxburgh from NDA, Joe McQue from the EA and Derek Lacey from NII get together and discuss issues in relation to the PBO transition to ensure that adequate arrangements are in place and that safety and environmental issues aren't compromised during this period of change.
161. In terms of future initiatives, these have been informed by NII's experience on the site and some of the details were contained in the report. NII is looking to take forward over the next 12 to 18 months major initiatives looking at maintenance, asset care, categorisation of mods and control of contractors on the Sellafield site.
162. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** asked what discussions he or the NII is having with Government. He noted that every meeting he came to, blame was attributed either to Sellafield Ltd or UKAEA or NDA, but he felt the reality of it was that the demise of the nuclear industry and the lack of funding for clean up lies sorely at the doors of the Labour party. Mr Shawcross commented that as a public body it is very easy for the NII to give improvement notice after improvement notice upon the Company but wanted to know what discussions NII is actually having with Government regarding the lack of funding needed for clean up?

163. **A: Mark Foy:** Responded that at this moment in time there are no detailed discussions undertaken with Government in terms of the lack of funding for clean up. Looking specifically at Sellafield if it were to issue a licensed instrument or particular enforcement action it would be targeted at areas of most risk, ie: the specifications that were mentioned earlier. In terms of the funding that is going forward for the next financial year the life time plan is still under development and NII has not got information as to what can and cannot be delivered because of the funding constraints and until NII has that information there is little it can do or consider. NII has been involved in discussions between the site licence company and NDA in terms of the position with the life time plan and what will and will not be funded until the life time plan is submitted.
164. **Q: Paul McKenna:** referred to page 6 – 2.5.1, 'HALES matters of strategic regulatory concern' and commented that the staffing level issues had been raised at least one year ago possibly earlier than that. He asked if the NII has some statutory authority to recommend that Sellafield Ltd recruit additional staff as it appeared that last year and this year there are insufficient resources there.
165. **A: Mark Foy:** Responded that there are conditions attached to the licence and one of those deals with suitably qualified and experience personnel, if it was felt necessary to take action in that respect then NII would do that, but at this moment in time NII is working with the new head of operating unit in this area to try and reconcile this particular issue.
166. **Q: Paul McKenna:** Commented that last years minutes of the WCSSG reported the same issue.
167. **A: Mark Foy:** was unable to comment on last years minutes as he was not a member at that time and hadn't seen them.
168. **Q: Paul McKenna:** Assured Mr Foy that if he checked the minutes he would see and he asked again whether NII had any statutory authority to recommend or insist that Sellafield Ltd recruit additional staff?
169. **A: Mark Foy:** responded that if NII considered it necessary to improve the number of suitably qualified and experienced staff then it could take appropriate action.
170. **Q: Paul McKenna:** Referred to page 8 of the NII report concerning the HAST bullet point two re: 'the conservative decision relating to the possible construction of smaller, safer replacement HASTs'. Dr McKenna asked for confirmation that there is sufficient time to allow that to be put into place if it became necessary?
171. **A: Mark Foy:** Replied that NII keep an oversight of what is happening in this particular area, because it is an area of real significant risk and there is data available in terms of cooling coil failure rates and whether cooling is likely to be compromised on the existing tanks. Mr Foy continued that at the moment there is no real urgency but as time progresses a solution will have to be worked up and delivered but currently NII has no concerns that it cannot be fulfilled.

172. **A: Neil Longfellow:** added that in terms of resources, Sellafield Ltd has increased the number of resources into that area and the NII is monitoring that situation with Sellafield Ltd. Resources have been increased into the High active area and there will be a judgement made by the new operating head that it is sufficient in line with Mr Foy's comments.
173. **Q: Paul McKenna:** commented that the lay person observing the minutes would interpret that people are just being rotated from place to place on site. He reiterated that sufficient personnel resources were needed for the whole site to take all business programmes forward.
174. **A: Neil Longfellow:** accepted the comment, however in context against the specific Highly Active area, resources have increased. Referring to the point of the HAST tank and Dr McKenna's question relating to having sufficient time to build these, Mr Longfellow stated that it would just further constrain Thorp reprocessing, for example you wouldn't put more material in if you didn't have HAST tank availability, so if you loose more HAST tanks clearly you wouldn't commit to more reprocessing of the Thorp material, so that is how you also control the timescales associated with new build.
175. **Q: Tim Knowles:** stated that he wasn't expecting to come along to the meeting and be disturbed about the situation on the site but having read the reports and listened to what has been said, he was. He continued that the uncertainties over funding, the position generally with uncertainties about the management of the site and about HASTS, legacy ponds and silos and this enormous change to a PBO contractor and the fact that the regulators are attempting to a) make things work better, b) don't know what the life time plan is yet, c) aren't sure that they are going to get the funding that they need to ensure that things are done the way they want it and d) we are going to go through the biggest managerial change in the history of the site, sometime in the next 12 months, it rather worried him in terms of the way things are being done.
176. **A: Mark Foy:** Responded that from a regulatory perspective NII recognised those concerns about the delay in the life time plan and this significant period of change which is one reason why NII looked to get non executive directors put in place on the Sellafield executive and that NII set up the senior regulatory transition group to try and oversee things at a senior level. NII also has inspectors at a lower level, seeing what is happening down on the ground. NII has the specifications in place to try and reduce risk and improve things on the site but in terms of the implications of funding constraints the information is not to hand at this moment in time about the actual implications of those. NII has a holding position at this moment in time where funding will be provided until such time that Sellafield presents the life time plan against which they believe they can deliver the work scope.
177. **Q: Martin Forwood:** referred to page 7 of the NII report regarding the revised HAL stocks specification. NII referred to the fact that in future the oxide liquors will be evaluated in tonnes. Mr Forwood commented that from memory the original specification actually dealt with volume rather than tonnes and he wondered why the change had been made. He had read the new specification and there were other figures in tonnes for oxide HAL, he couldn't understand

why they don't go down and thought the specification was supposed to be a reduction programme but the figures shown in tonnes for oxide stay at the same level right up until 2014?

178. **A: Mark Foy:** Apologised that he couldn't give the detail against why NII has gone across to tonnes and as to why it stays at the same level. He offered to take it away and come back with a written answer.

179. ITEM 9 – REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

180. The Chairman invited Andy Mayall to present the report. Mr Mayall intended to take the report as read and would highlight a few issues under three separate headings; first of all he would talk about authorisations and permits that EA has issued or varied in the last few months, he would then talk about some compliance and enforcement issues before talking about a couple of EA's strategic objectives and progress against them.

181. In terms of authorisations and permits, Mr Mayall reported that EA had issued a variation to the Sellafield RSA authorisation on 1st April that brought into force several minor changes to the Sellafield authorisation. Mr Mayall was pleased to say it also included the transfer of the RSA authorisation from UKAEA for Windscale to Sellafield Ltd and as Mr Mann had already mentioned that had been a culmination of a lot of hard work by a lot of people over many months.

182. In October 2007 EA issued a PPC permit for the Sellafield site. The Pollution, Prevention and Control regulations is the other major piece of legislation that EA deal with at Sellafield principally dealing with non radioactive pollution and various other environmental impacts.

183. The incident at the CHP facility required EA to make quite a rapid change to that PPC permit in allowing the plant to operate on lower stack heights for a short period of time to allow the site's steam supply to reach its normal capacity. That was carried out in February.

184. In terms of Compliance, Assessment and Enforcement, Mr Mayall was pleased to say that for 2007, radioactive discharges to air and water were all well below the authorised limits partly due to low reprocessing rates during that year. The assessed radiation dose to people from those current levels of discharges are well below the legal dose limits.

185. As reported previously the beach monitoring has continued with the total number of radioactive finds reaching 365. The radioactivity associated with those finds are all well below levels to cause concerns from a health perspective but Mr Mayall stated that EA keep the issue under close review. The advice from the Health Protection Agency remains the same with regards to the use of the beaches, that no special precautions are necessary.

186. During December EA supported a request from its Scottish regulatory colleagues (Scottish Environment Protection Agency) to carry out a short monitoring exercise on the North Solway coastline, that monitoring was conducted by

Sellafield Ltd under EA's direction for one week which produced no finds of radioactive material.

187. Mr Mayall reported that EA had carried out a team inspection at Sellafield in December 07 to follow up on work going on at the site to improve the prevention and minimisation of solids in liquid wastes which is a requirement of the authorisation. There have been some improvements in that area but EA believes there remains more improvements including a serious look at whether the end of pipe filtration at the site needs to be improved.
188. EA has sent three warning letters out during the period of the previous quarter to the Sellafield site, one had already been alluded to by Mr Longfellow in relation to a plant limit breach at the fuel handling plant which goes back to 2006 and also another warning letter in relation to failing to notify EA of temporary damage to sealine filters and another warning letter to the Low Level Waste Repository in relation to sampling and analysis issues there which have been reported previously.
189. EA has several ongoing investigations including joint investigative work with the NII investigating why the CHP ended up in a position where it had serious corrosion on the stack. EA is also investigating damage to sealine filters and has instigated an investigation into a recent spillage from one of the effluent treatment plants.
190. Moving onto strategic objectives, Mr Mayall reported EA is closely involved with NII in monitoring the management of change aspects of the forthcoming PBO transition at the site.
191. Also, in terms of the NDA strategy EA continues to have concerns about funding issues and the funding model and that had formed a major part of EA's response to the NDA's consultation on its business plan recently. EA continues to monitor with the NII the implications of the funding issues at the site.
192. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Asked Mr Mayall as a public body what meetings is he or the EA having with Government to stress the importance of funding to reduce or eliminate the risks and hazards on the Sellafield site?
193. **A: Andy Mayall:** Responded that to his knowledge there have been no direct meetings with Government, but what the EA is doing is monitoring the situation at all levels in the NDA and with the SLCs involved. EA has set up a senior review group which involves the Chief Inspector from NII and also representatives of EA's Chief Executive. Also in the covering letter to the NDA's recent consultation on its business plan, Baroness Young, EA's Chief Executive has offered to the NDA that EA will try and work with them to take the difficult arguments to Government if necessary.
194. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Thanked Mr Mayall for his response and continued that he was disappointed that two public bodies (NII and EA) were not engaging with the people who hold the funds.

195. **A: Mark Foy:** added that if it was considered that there was a need to take it to senior Government level then both NII and EA would do that – there would be no reason why they shouldn't do that if considered necessary.
196. **Q: Dr Astbury:** Referred to page 7 of the EA report - section 3.2. The report stated that increased concentrations of iodine 129 had been found in milk on a farm. He had particular concerns about iodine 129 because it sits in the environment for 15.7 million years half life; it readily goes into the food chain and it can have an adverse effect on health. Dr Astbury requested that the committee be kept up to date with the issue?
197. **A: Andy Mayall:** agreed and offered more background. He responded that the monitoring is carried out by Sellafield Ltd as part of its environmental monitoring programme and it had reported to the EA at the latter stages of last year that some increase of iodine 129 in milk had been seen from a particular farm. The latest reports Mr Mayall had heard was that the levels have now come back down to limited detection levels but there is currently as far as he understood no obvious explanation for the short term increase. Mr Mayall endeavoured to provide another report and he thought it was possibly something that Sellafield Ltd could do also in conjunction with EA.
198. **Q: David Humphreys:** was surprised to find a milk report in an EA report. He had then looked in the Food Standards Agency report and there was no mention of raised levels of iodine in milk in that report. He asked who is responsible for reporting it as he would have expected it to be in the FSA report and not the EA's?
199. **A: Andy Mayall:** explained that the EA reported on the Sellafield statutory environmental monitoring programme which the Environment Agency require them to carry out as part of their duties under the Radioactive Substances Act. The EA report is reporting on a finding from Sellafield's own monitoring programme. While the EA draws upon the results of the FSA's food monitoring programme to supplement its own environmental monitoring (the EA doesn't carry out any food monitoring of its own) and the combined programmes are reported in the joint FSA/EA/SEPA/DoE(NI) RIFE report, the FSA programme is in fact independent of both industry and regulators as FSA has the statutory responsibility for safety of the food chain and its affect on public health. In terms of this particular set of results they originated from Sellafield Ltd's own monitoring programme.
200. **Q: David Humphreys:** asked John Haywood to comment.
201. **A: John Haywood:** commented that his committee (Environmental Health sub committee) had not seen it which made it rather difficult to comment on, however he was not altogether surprised that occasionally unusual analysis findings occur and without explanation. Professor Haywood suggested that perhaps we should consider submitting this to the international journal of un-reproducible results.
202. **A: Andy Mayall:** wished to emphasise that in terms of radiological impact the increase in levels of iodine was not significant, it was only significant (and he

accepted that it should have been made clear in the report) in terms that it was an unusual trend but it wasn't significant in terms of radiation dose.

203. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** Asked where the substance had actually come from in his experience he thought iodine 129 came from the old reactor programme?
204. **A: Andy Mayall:** responded that it is discharged under authorisation currently from the Thorp facility when it is operating and also from Magnox reprocessing.
205. **Q: Paul McKenna:** referred to page 11 - 4.5, the last sentence relating to the EA not being satisfied with the site best available technique standards (BAT) for dealing with liquid effluents, and asked if Mr Mayall could give more detail on that?
206. **A: Andy Mayall:** responded that it related principally to a requirement that EA placed on the company to submit or develop documented standards for treatment of effluents across the site, it principally relates to documented standards. He commented that the EA is not saying that standards across the site are inadequate, but what it is saying is that it was unhappy with the fitness for purpose of the documented material.
207. **Q: Paul McKenna:** asked where you would look to see standards and best practice for the environmental remediation and clean up of effluents. He asked if a company devised the standards, was it WANO or whoever?
208. **A: Andy Mayall:** responded that there are a variety of sources including WANO and IAEA. EA is pushing for greater standardisation across the industry if possible and is working closely with SLCs and the NDA to ascertain if the idea can be taken forward, recognising that Sellafield is perhaps a unique and complex site.
209. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** commented that when using the word significant (referring to the EA's reporting of Iodine) in a document, the significance of significant needs to be defined, because it is significantly different from what has been seen in the past but in terms of health it is very non significant. He felt it unnecessarily worried people.
210. Mr Hargreaves also referred to page 10 of the EA report in which it mentioned the series of meetings on integrated waste strategy. Mr Hargreaves thought they were extremely well organised by Sellafield Ltd and had gone very well. He felt that they gave the opportunity for a lot of people who are not normally associated with high levels of radioactivity and who have input to make from dealing with low level waste disposal generally. He thought Sellafield Ltd ought to be congratulated.
211. Mr Hargreaves concluded by referring to page 12 of the EA report, and supported the worries highlighted in paragraph 4.6 that some really quite important work might be deferred because of funding constraints. He continued that it has taken a long time to get the pile decommissioning into the very strong position that it is and he felt there would be a lot of good work going to waste to delay it for a long time and have to start doing things again.

212. ITEM 10 - REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE

213. Professor Haywood reported that the sub committee held its meeting on the 29th November and the draft minutes of that meeting were included in the reports to this meeting so his intention was to select some items for summary.
214. He reported that the committee had received reports of measurements of Sellafield related activity in the environment in 2006. The reports also estimate the extent to which Sellafield radioactivity adds to the natural radiation exposure of local people, particularly those from groups at highest risk of exposure.
215. The reports were presented by scientists from Sellafield Ltd, the Environment Agency, the Food Standards Agency and the Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science.
216. The Food Standards Agency estimated that in 2006, a small number of local people whose diet includes very large quantities of seafood received a dose of about 230 microsieverts as a consequence of current and previous Sellafield discharges. This was marginally higher than the comparable estimate for 2005. The difference arose not from increases in discharges but rather from changes in seafood consumption.
217. Professor Haywood reported that for many years, the former Albright and Wilson plant at Whitehaven discharged gypsum containing natural radioactivity into Saltom Bay. Much of this activity is still present in local sediments and in 2006 it contributed more to the radiation dose of the seafood critical group than did Sellafield discharges.
218. It is estimated that in 2006 these two sources of radiation exposure gave a combined dose of about 470 uSv to the seafood critical group. This group is representative of members of the public with the greatest exposure to Sellafield discharge. However, the dose they received was significantly lower than the 1000 microsieverts annual dose limit for members of the public, even including the Whitehaven gypsum contribution. It may also be compared with approximately 2230 microsieverts average dose received by UK residents from natural radioactivity.
219. Other pathways for radiation exposure affecting other critical groups were also reported to the sub committee but the associated radiation doses were considerably lower.
220. In order to estimate critical group doses, a wide range of foods and environmental samples and a wide range of concentrations are analysed by the site operator and the agencies. Dr Paul McDonald of Westlakes Scientific Consulting reported on the extent of agreement between the monitoring results of the site operator and the agencies. Agreement was generally good; Professor Haywood stated that it gave the committee confidence in the figures that were being quoted.

221. In conclusion, Professor Haywood reported that the sub committee also received and discussed updates on the beach monitoring and ground water monitoring programmes.

222. ITEM 11 – REPORT FROM EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

223. David Moore presented the report and began by reporting that it was the 57th meeting of the emergency planning sub committee and was held on the 10th March. Mr Moore reported that he was concerned at the lack of people who actually attended the meeting, it had been a very poor turnout, he being the only member that attended. He encouraged members to attend the committee which he felt was a very important committee which overseen the emergency planning aspects of the Sellafield site.

224. The committee received a list of the exercises that had taken place and the actions were pointed out from them. Mr Moore did not intend to go through all of the actions as most of them were quite small issues and they had all been actioned.

225. The committee agreed that the LLWR should now be required to attend the meeting in future. LLWR will now be responsible for its own emergency planning and plan their own exercises and therefore the committee felt it was important that they should join the emergency planning committee.

226. The committee had been given an update on the siren project, and it was hoped that members of the committee would be able to be involved in looking at the different types of sirens and warning sounds that may be sounded.

227. Another issue that had been discussed at the meeting was something that had originated from a meeting at Copeland Borough Council which was looking at the contingency plan for the general public to access the Sellafield site in the event of the A595 being closed. This issue had been brought up some years ago when the A595 was blocked by a road traffic accident for some 45 hours. A plan was put in place that time where key workers, ie: doctors, nurses, school teachers people who are key workers could register with the site and be escorted through the site at any time that the A595 was blocked.

228. Currently the only people who can travel through the site if the A595 is blocked is blue light services and there will be no restrictions on those services. Mr Moore continued that it had been some time since the process had been assessed and as the A595 had been blocked again in December 07 for a long period the committee was asked to revisit the arrangements. Both Sellafield Ltd and the Civil Nuclear Constabulary had been actioned to revisit the processes and procedures for that contingency plan and the Chairman has asked for feed back before the next Emergency Planning meeting.

229. Moving onto the last item which is the changes to the Sellafield on and off site emergency plan and new householder leaflet that is due for distribution, Mr Moore asked David Humphreys to update the committee on that issue.

230. Mr Humphreys explained that for many years the system that has existed at the Sellafield site is that the site siren has been sounded at Sellafield emergency status. He explained that there are two emergency levels at the site, one is site incident and one is Sellafield emergency. Site incident indicates that there is a threat to the safety of the site but not to members of the public. A Sellafield emergency indicates that there is a threat to the safety of both site and public.
231. Mr Humphreys continued that historically the siren has always been primarily intended to warn the site not the public and recently the NII had asked the Sellafield site to consider sounding the siren at site incident and that is what is now going to happen.
232. The siren will be sounded at site incident and it will also be sounded at Sellafield emergency. For the personnel on site, if they hear the siren they shelter. For the public, it now introduces a slight complication because the siren may be sounded, they may hear it and there is no need to take any action at that time.
233. Mr Humphrey's reported that the new system is going to be introduced on 1st May 08 and has required a number of things to be put in place which Mr Humphreys intended to explain to members. He felt some of the changes would be of real benefit to the warning and informing of the public, which he felt was very important.
234. The message to the public is that if you hear the siren you need to find out why the siren is sounding, it can be an exercise, it can be a site incident or it can be a Sellafield emergency, that is the very simple message, you hear the siren, and find out why it is sounding.
235. Mr Humphreys explained that there are a number of ways that you are going to be able to find out, one is that there will be messages on local radio that is nothing new, the second one which again is not a new initiative that certain members of the public close to the Sellafield site are telephoned by a computerised system and that will not change. Mr Humphrey's wished to emphasise that it is possible that the siren may sound twice, it can sound at site incident and it may then sound at Sellafield emergency, so everyone on the system will be telephoned when there is a change in the state.
236. The new initiatives that have been introduced is that from May 1st there will be a free phone telephone number which anybody can dial and it will give an update on what the situation is at the site. David Humphreys demonstrated the message using a mobile phone. 'The Sellafield site is operating normally, there is no emergency'. If there is an emergency the message will tell you what the situation is and if any action is required.
237. The last initiative is that information will also be put on the Cumbria alert website, www.cumbriaalert.info. To recap Mr Humphreys explained that when the siren sounds there will be five things; the siren sounds, certain people around the site are telephoned, the message on the machine changes, messages on local radio and the website. In order for all these changes to be communicated to the public a number of things are happening. The main thing is that a new public information leaflet has been produced and is being distributed within the next

two or three weeks in time for the 1st May. Mr Humphrey's had brought copies to the meeting for members to take away with them along with a covering letter which explains the changes, there would also be a publicity campaign in the local newspapers.

238. In conclusion, Mr Humphrey's reported that on Thursday 8th May in the morning there is a level one site exercise at the Sellafield site and all of the new arrangements will be tested.
239. **David Moore:** added that when the arrangements are tested there will be publicity through the local media to encourage the public to use the number hopefully in great numbers so its resilience can be tested. He felt it was a major step forward as the committee has questioned for some time the adequacy of the site siren system which is quite aged and does not always work that effectively. He continued that when the new site sirens are installed then it will be a fully up-to-date modern system. He thought it was right in today's society that you can pick a telephone up and find out what state the site is at.
240. **Q: Joe Clark:** Asked if the emergency planning sub committee would also oversee the Studsvik emergency plan, given that they would be carrying contaminated materials and will have a facility which he assumed would have containment which could be breached in an accident or in a terrorist attack?
241. **A: David Moore:** Responded that Studsvik had asked to become a member of the WCSSG, which the group had accepted and as such the committee would expect reports at regular meetings. He felt it important that the group could also scrutinise its emergency planning processes. Mr Moore assumed that Studsvik would come under County Council emergency planning and asked David Humphrey's if that was correct?
242. **A: David Humphreys:** explained that the situation is that there are a number of sites carrying radioactive materials notably the low level waste repository at Drigg, where although they come under the REPPIR regulations they are not actually required to produce an emergency plan.
243. **(note from secretariat):** - Information has been received since the meeting that the Studsvik Site Licence states that HSE has accepted Studsvik's assessment that they are below limits requiring an Off Site Emergency Plan (OSEP) (under REPPIR) and NII has assessed the emergency arrangements and found them to be acceptable).
244. **Q: R Wright:** Commented that the sirens were obviously very adequate for site incidents, however he couldn't remember the last time in Gosforth he had heard a siren go off. Wind conditions can easily prevent someone from hearing the siren and the emergency line depends on you first hearing a warning of some sort. He asked if it would be possible for places such as Beckermat, Gosforth and Calderbridge that there could be remote control sirens that could be initiated from the site but would operate there. These could only go off at times of a full scale emergency and they would ensure people knew it was happening.

245. **A: David Humphreys:** responded that it was a feature that had been discussed and there was no reason other than funds and the will to do it why it hadn't been instigated. He continued that the emergency planning group was very keen on a different system of alerting the public and that was cell broadcasting which is using mobile phones. An emergency message could be broadcast to every mobile phone within the area. He agreed that there are problems with sirens in that they are weather dependent, they are also dependent on whether you had double glazing in your home or not. This was still under discussion.
246. **Norman McPhail:** Commented that the only caveat to that is that it is a requirement to sound the siren within a 2km radius of the site.
247. **David Moore:** added that although the regulations are met it was always quite clear that the sirens were there to warn the workforce, anything outside of that was over and above what was expected in the regulations. He thought the technology the committee is talking about isn't too far removed from where mobile phones can be contacted within a given area, the technology is there and as it becomes more refined it will become cheaper and probably more palatable for the site licence company to look at.
248. **Q: Norman Clarkson:** had a concern with Mr Humphrey's comments regarding costs, he felt that the necessary bodies needed to be informed if there is a problem with costs certainly on site safety and particularly warning the public around the site. He asked if it could be possible that if it was just a site testing a continuous blast could be used but in a real emergency an intermittent blast could be used and everyone would know that it was a site emergency?
249. **A: David Humphreys:** responded that the current siren is now an old siren system and can only make one note. He re-iterated what the Chairman has said that Sellafield is actively inviting contracts for the supply of a new siren system and Mr Humphreys had been assured that this will be available within the next 12 months. The siren systems that have been looked at are state of the art and can do a number of things, they can sound lots of different tones and they can even be used as a PA system where you can actually give voice messages over the siren system, there is also a facility for using flashing lights and various other things. He was very confident that within 12 months there would be a very much better warning system than we have at the moment.
250. **David Moore:** commented that he had been offered the opportunity to accompany Emergency Planning representatives when they are talking to the companies to look at what is available and perhaps listen to some of the sounds. He suggested that Norman Clarkson might also like to accompany him.
251. **Peter Connolly:** Asked what the date of the next Emergency Planning meeting was?
252. **A: (Note from Secretariat):** 8th September, Cleator Moor Civic Hall 1300 – 1600hrs
253. **ITEM 12 – REPORT FROM WINDSCALE SUB COMMITTEE**

254. The Chairman invited Ranald Stewart to present the report who began by reporting that the Windscale sub committee no longer exists.
255. The last meeting was held on 4th March and the report had been submitted which Mr Stewart had nothing to add to.
256. Mr Stewart endorsed the Chairman's earlier thanks to the members of the committee for the contribution and support during the three years of the sub committee's existence.
- 257. ITEM 13 – REPORT ON LOW LEVEL WASTE SUB COMMITTEE**
258. David Moore presented the report as Sue Brown was unable to attend the meeting. He explained that there was a report that was circulated to members which covered the meeting that had taken place in March. He didn't intend to go into that report in great detail because there had been a meeting the day prior to the WCSSG meeting which Mr Moore intended to report on. The report had not yet been circulated to members as there hadn't been sufficient time.
259. The new PBO took over the management of the LLWR on Tuesday 1st April UKNWM was the successful bidder for the running of the Low Level Waste facility.
260. Referring to the first meeting Mr Moore highlighted that the competition contract has now been signed for vault 9 and the new contractors have been assigned.
261. Mr Moore reported that the LLW sub committee meeting had been changed to enable the new PBO to be present. A report was received from Dr Andy Baker on the BPO process for the LLW Post Closure Safety Case. It was an interim view and some of the general summaries that came out of it is the site is safe now and the safety case considers safety of the facility for 1000 years into the future. Current updates suggest that doses and risks are below applicable quantitative limits. Separate considerations were required for the trenches and vaults on the grounds that the trenches were designed and approved not against current standards. Mr Moore continued that the trenches were designed years ago, and it considered what work can be done to strengthen those and what work can be done with regards to the big movement and flows of water through those. It was considered that generally the site is fit for purpose, there are some issues that have to be looked at in the future and there will be a more detailed report that has to go to the Environment Agency.
262. Dick Raaz outlined elements of the UKNWM'S bid, explaining how their proposals could dramatically extend the use of the existing facility for a number of years at a substantially reduced cost to the UK tax payer (billions) which Mr Moore reported the committee was pleased to hear.
263. Further co-ordinated development on a number of processes are under consideration ranging from segregation, minimisation, avoidance, treatment and packaging. Mr Moore commented that for the new PBO's to receive fee it wasn't just about what throughputs they put into the site, but also what they don't put into the site, its about the long term management of Low Level Waste and

minimising what goes into the site. He felt that some of the exciting things that the committee had heard ie: that the PBO could extend the length of the site, was very good particularly if there is a year on year income coming from that into the socio economic pot, the committee would be pleased for it to continue indefinitely.

264. Mr Moore felt it was important to accept that we are now in a new era. The PBO had said that they are open and transparent. He thought they would be quite prepared to share as much with the stakeholders as they possibly could. They are developing the processes, and have an idea of what the problems are. He thought that consultation with stakeholders had been good enough at the moment and he looked forward to working with them as he thought the other members of the community should. It is an important new step forward, and before the end of the year the community would be dealing with a new PBO on the Sellafield site. Mr Moore reported that the PBO has a 5 year contract and was sure they would want to extend them to longer periods which depended on them delivering.
265. Another issue that had been discussed was the Low Level Waste Facility and it's downgrading to a category 4 site because there is no longer PCM on the site. The committee had been undertaking some work with CNC to look at whether they could provide a guarding service for the site. Because the site no longer required an armed response the committee now had to find a guarding service from elsewhere. CNC felt that it could not operate anything lower than the standard of an armed officer. The committee had requested to be consulted on the advertising of the contract details for the guarding service and was quite clear that it would not accept anything but a professional guarding service. CNC had offered some support in the event of an incident on the Low Level Waste facility, however the committee didn't have full details of that.
266. **Q: Henry Wormstrup:** referred to the LLW report and highlighted 'condition 9 of the planning application', he commented that Sellafield had been very good historically when it had built pond 5 and Thorp with regards to keeping construction wagons off the A595 at in-muster and out-muster times. He asked if that would be the case for vault 9 construction.
267. **A: David Moore:** responded that the majority of materials going into the LLW site for the construction would go via rail. It was a condition that was placed on the contractor as a challenge. The contractor will now source its materials from places where it can be transported by rail. There may be the occasional increase of loads by road, but that has been minimised. The majority of materials will go by rail?
268. **Q: Mr Wright** asked regarding the £1,000,000 package and the £1.5 per annum whether the committee has put in a case as to why this is necessary and what it will be used for. He asked for details as to where the money will be applied?
269. **A: David Moore:** responded that it was quite difficult to say where it will go. What is quite clear is these were negotiations with Government and the NDA. The only thing that is clear and agreed at the moment is the amount of money. £50K will be ring fenced for use by Drigg Village via the Parish Council. The mechanism for that as Mr Moore had mentioned earlier would be discussed with

the NDA at a meeting to be held on 4/4/08. There would be some delivery group that would be set up to manage that amount of money and how it is distributed. He continued that it had to be within the socio economic plans of the NDA as well as those that meet the community aspirations.

270. **Q: Mr Wright:** responded that apart from the £50K for Drigg, there should also be a certain concentration of it in the slightly wider area surrounding Drigg as opposed to the whole of Cumbria.
271. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** clarified that the fund is to benefit Copeland, there was £50K ring-fenced for the village because they have the immediate effect of hosting the Low Level Waste facility. She felt however that there had to be an understanding when you have a nuclear facility, it isn't just the immediate vicinity that feels any negative benefits, there is wider economic, social and environmental implications and the money is there to offset any detriment of hosting the facility but it has to be spent for the benefit of the people of Copeland.
272. **Q: R Wright:** asked if there would be an opportunity for the community to make cases in the future when that money is available?
273. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** responded that there would be but it would have to be spent in line with the NDA socio economic policy. It is not intended for flower beds and a couple of pots here and there, it has to be a long term fund, because that facility is going to be there for 100's and 1000's of years to come. A certain amount has to be put aside to generate interest so it is there for the people in the future not just to benefit the people now. There has to be a lot of thought into how it is to be spent to ensure the wider benefits are felt but she was sure there would be a small community pot which will allow smaller communities to bid in for schemes that will raise the pride in communities and raise moral, but there is still a lot of work to be done.
274. **Q: Joe Clark:** was concerned as a non scientist about the downgrading of security at the Low Level Waste repository because there is no PCM. The concept of getting group 4 or someone to guard a site that the public perceive as holding nuclear material is entirely wrong. He continued that there may not be the risk of a terrorist threat because of PCM being spread, but there was still the 'dirty bomb' scenario, and the possibility of economic chaos referring to the studsvik facility and if something was breached there part of West Cumbria would be shut down while safety checks were carried out. He was concerned at the apparent acceptance that the site can be downgraded in terms of security simply because of a scientific formula.
275. **A: David Moore:** responded that he was raising the very concerns that the LLW sub committee raised at the meeting when it was first put forward nearly 12 months ago. CNC had said they would come forward with a proposal. Mr Moore commented that CNC was looking at perhaps community officers that were slightly less than an armed force but still under CNC; that had been taken to their board and was not agreed. OCNS has clearly said the sites category now will be category 4. The LLW sub committee has asked that it gets what it requires which is not low grade security but a proper guarding service which

would hopefully be a long term contract and would hopefully involve local recruitment.

276. ITEM 15 – REPORT ON CALDER HALL SUB COMMITTEE

277. Cllr Norman Clarkson reported that sadly the 5th and final meeting had been held on 20th February and he wished to point out that despite the ‘old girl being put to sleep’ the site still needs to maintain Calder Hall in a safe state and one of the most important departments therefore is the engineering department who are accountable for the routine monitoring of the plants condition. Resource levels in that department are not changing and they would still have quite a high workload.

278. He also pointed out that there is one reactor that is being kept in a state of readiness to accommodate any further change in the de-fuelling programme. He publicly thanked the site staff and in particular Mr Paul Brennan for all the help that had been given to him as Chairman and he re-iterated what he had said many times before, that he was very impressed with the site safety record it is a great achievement.

279. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** wished to clarify, when it was reported that one reactor is being kept in a state of readiness that presumably is a state of readiness to be decommissioned?

280. **A: Norman Clarkson:** Yes

281. ITEM 15 – REPORT FROM THE SOCIO ECONOMIC SUB COMMITTEE

282. Cllr Woodburn reported that she felt the committee was going to be quite an active committee and she would welcome any new members who would like to take part.

283. Cllr Clark had raised a couple of areas of concerns which were not new to the area and that was why local organisations have already been doing a lot of work, including plans to get Government support to offset some of the detriments that are going to be coming along, but she reported there was still a lot of work that needed to be done. The intention was that the socio economic sub committee was going to be one of the organisations that it going to keep an eye on it and ensure all the socio economic money is hopefully spent in the direction that we want it to be spent to ensure that it has maximum benefit. Cllr Woodburn looked forward to Chairing it.

284. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** referred to companies such as Courtoulds, Kangol, Cross Paperware, Millers Shoes, British steel, the mines, Fishers headboards, High Duty Alloys, Sekers etc., which sadly had all now gone. Mr Shawcross continued that they all went under the current governance group. He asked what was different today, why should we believe that we are now in a safe pair of hands?

285. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** felt it was difficult to fully answer the question without getting too political and she didn't feel it was the arena for that. She did think however that the current Government is more positive than what we had in the past in that it is willing to move forward with Nuclear, and hadn't closed the door to reprocessing. It had also signed up to a master plan that when implemented will change the future of Copeland but would still have nuclear at its core and no other Government has actually made that step.
286. With regard to the NDA socio economic policy, Cllr Woodburn commented that she hadn't made any claim that it would change the future. Copeland had made a lot of comments on it, none of which were taken on board, she felt there was a lot of work that still needed to be put into that. She felt the NDA needed to further recognise its responsibility on socio economics and actually put some resources into the area instead of having to rely on efficiency savings. The fund that was secured for the low level waste site she thought was a sign of things to come and she thought it demonstrated that you can get resources into the area and that is a first step towards getting the resources that we need. It wasn't just money however, it is getting all the organisations on board. The new PBO would be one of the most important organisations to help move the area forward. She had a lot more hope that it could be done as she thought there was finally the buy in from the organisations that was needed, but it wasn't going to be easy.
287. **Cllr Clark:** Was concerned about anybody who is unemployed whether from Allerdale, Copeland or Barrow. He felt it was important that all worked together to try and create a better system and a better economic standing for Cumbria.
288. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** Responded that there are a lot of organisations who are putting a lot of resources into West Cumbria. She thought the difficulty was that there isn't yet a 'core vision' that everyone has bought into. She stated that the socio economic sub committee had a role to play in helping to influence it.
- 289. ITEM 16 - VOTE FOR CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**
290. There were two nominations received, one for Chairman for Cllr David Moore and one for Elaine Woodburn for Vice Chairman. Both were re-instated as Chair and Vice Chair of the WCSSG for a further two years.
- 291. ITEM 17 – DATES AND VENUES OF NEXT MEETING**
292. The Chairman commented that invitations were sent out to all members of the WCSSG and many responses are not received back as to which members are going to attend. The Chairman reminded members that a free stamped addressed envelope is included and urged people to reply as to whether they are coming or sending a substitute. In the future only those who reply to say they are coming to the meeting will receive the full pack of information. Others will still be able to access them on the website and copies will still be made available for observers on the day.
293. The Chairman reported that the next meeting of the WCSSG will be Thursday 3rd July 2008 at the Ennerdale Country House Hotel.

294. The next WCSSG scrutiny meeting will be on Thursday 2nd October at Cleator Moor Civic Hall.
295. With that the Chairman closed the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.