

**MINUTES OF THE 5th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT CLEATOR MOOR CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 4TH OCTOBER 2007**

Present:

Mrs Janice Oliver	-	St John's Parish Council
Cllr P Connolly	-	Copeland Borough Council
Dr Colin Hill	-	Churches Forum
Mr R Hargreaves	-	St John's Parish Council
Mr P Tyson	-	Windscale sub committee
Mr R Wright	-	Gosforth Parish Council
Dr Nigel Calvert	-	Health Protection Agency
Dr J Astbury	-	Health Protection Agency
Mr Mike Coward	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Prof Steve Jones	-	Westlakes Research Institute
Cllr S Brown	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr Ranald Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Mr Steve Lewis	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr A Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Prof J Haywood	-	Environmental Health sub committee
Mr P Mann	-	UKAEA
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Mr John Clarke	-	Sellafield Ltd & International Nuclear Services
Mr Mark Dixon	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Cllr M Davidson	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr J A Clark	-	UKAEA Prospect
Mr Tony Jones	-	Prospect Union
Stewart Kemp	-	Cumbria Country Council
Mr F McMorrow	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mrs Sue Brett	-	Cumbria County Council
Alan Clark	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr P Kane	-	GMB Union
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mr D Mason	-	Sellafield Ltd
Supt. Phil Bishop	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Chief Supt. Ian Cardwell	-	Cumbria Constabulary

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the fifth 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. He also announced that there was a photographer taking photo's of the meeting to update the website.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. 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 05 APRIL 2007

4. The Chairman asked if there were any amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 05 April 07.
5. Professor Haywood made a correction to the minutes and explained that the wrong sub multiple for the sievert had been used on paragraphs 158 – 160. The millisieverts should be read as microsieverts. Following the amendment the minutes were accepted as a true record.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 4th MEETING

6. There were no matters arising.

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

7. The Chairman started the report by explaining that the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group had been running for some time during which the way the Sellafield site is operating has changed. He referred to the re-deferral of Calder Hall and the ongoing work with the Windscale amalgamation and said that the work carried out by those sub committees is reducing. He went on to say that the committee needed to focus more on decommissioning and on commercial operations.
8. He referred to a previous question raised at an earlier meeting of WCSSG regarding the setting up of a Sellafield sub committee. It had been something the committee had intended to do however the workload associated with the site end states consultation had diverted the group from setting up the committee. It now seemed a good time to recommend some changes.
9. He suggested that if the group felt the suggested changes were the correct way forward then 'terms of reference' would be developed for the sub committees for approval at a later meeting.
10. He explained that he felt it was right for the group to focus on decommissioning and the commercial operations and that those committees would encompass Calder Hall, the Windscale site and the Sellafield Site.

11. He went on to report that a key area for the group was socio economics. Currently there is no opportunity to scrutinise socio economic aspects or look at the way forward for those. He felt it was appropriate to convene a sub committee to look at socio economics which could also have a broader remit to include funding issues.
12. He explained that there would be no intention to alter the Environmental Health and Emergency Planning sub committees or the low level waste sub committee. The LLW site will be the first site to have a new PBO and has some interesting times ahead, so as it moves into a new faze it will require its own sub committee.
13. The Chairman's sub committee will also remain unchanged which will respond to any issues that require a quick response.
14. **Ranald Stewart:** commented that with regards to the Windscale sub committee, he felt the timing was right and felt that the concerns raised at the inception of the sub committee had all been addressed and everyone was now working fully towards transition and integration with the Sellafield Site.
15. **Elaine Woodburn:** welcomed the socio economic sub committee. She felt that with regard to the decommissioning and clean up activities it was important that some of the contracts given to decommissioning should have a socio-economic aspect within them. She asked if there was any intention to have any liaison between the socio-economic sub committee and the decommissioning sub committee?
16. **David Moore:** replied that the terms of reference would be drawn up taking on the views of people at the meeting and Elaine's comment would be included. He hoped that the terms of reference would be available for agreement at the January meeting enabling them to become official from April 08 when Calder Hall will have been deferred and the Windscale amalgamation will have taken place. The Calder Hall sub committee and the Windscale sub committee will continue to operate until that time.
17. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked whether it would be better if the socio economic sub committee could be up and running as soon as possible given that a new PBO will be starting at the LLW repository in April 08?
18. **David Moore:** Replied that if that was the view of members then he could arrange to have some terms of reference written for circulation amongst members for comment. He thought the secretariat could ensure that prior to the next meeting.
19. David went on to say that as the committees are evolved the secretariat would be writing to members to be involved in the committees.
20. **Steve Lewis:** thought the change was a sensible thing to do. He made the comment that in the stage immediately after 1st April 08 Windscale and Sellafield would still legally be two separately licensed sites and then there would be work undertaken to integrate them into a single licensed site, but could still be dealt with in a common way.

21. **David Moore:** thanked Mr Lewis for the clarification.
22. **R Kemp:** supported the timescale for the review because it would allow time to take into account the current review that is underway by the NDA on local arrangements for stakeholder engagement which could be incorporated into the terms of reference.
23. **Martin Forwood:** Stated that he fully supported the proposals, he asked why it had taken so long given that he had written in March 06 asking for what was essentially a commercial operations sub committee?
24. **David Moore:** Reiterated that the site end states consultation workload had sidetracked the committee as it had taken up a lot of member's time and commitment which caused difficulty in getting people together to set up a new committee. He apologised for the length of time it had taken.
25. **Martin Forwood:** asked if the Chairman envisaged that the commercial operations sub committee would be set up pretty quickly?
26. **David Moore:** replied that he was hoping to have all the terms of reference ready for the January meeting.
27. **Martin Forwood:** reported that he was glad to see that International Nuclear Services were in attendance which had also been a suggestion of his some 18 months ago.
28. **David Moore:** commented that the committee took requests very seriously.
29. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked if the socio economic sub committee would receive full support from the NDA. She went on to say she was quite happy with the site licence company but there were wider implications with regards to socio economics and wanted to ensure the full support of the NDA.
30. **Mark Dixon:** Responded that the NDA would support the socio economic sub committee by going along to the meetings, he asked if that was the support she was asking for?
31. **Elaine Woodburn:** responded that she was happy for that as an initial commitment.
32. **David Moore:** Reported that the secretariat would move the actions forward as quickly as it could. He also reported that with regards to site end states, the NDA had fed back its view on the site end states to him and he felt that it was important that the WCSSG should receive feedback. He announced that the secretariat had set up a meeting for the 14th November 07 at Cleator Moor Civic Hall at a time to be determined – (Note from secretariat the meeting has been scheduled for 1300hrs). The NDA and AMEC, the contractor that did the work on the site ends states would be available to give a full presentation to everybody on its views of what they see as the site end states.

33. He further reported that the group needed to comment on the views in order for them to be included in the NDA strategy. The intention was also to send out invitations to all members of the public who were involved in the process.
34. **AGENDA ITEM 5 – REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR SERVICES**
35. The Chairman invited John Clarke to present the report who began by introducing himself for the purpose of the report as the Managing Director of International Nuclear Services Ltd.
36. Mr Clarke intended to highlight a few key points from the report that had been produced by Alaister Brown and take any questions following it.
37. He explained that International Nuclear Services is a subsidiary company of Sellafield Ltd which is 51% owned by Sellafield Ltd and 49% owned by the NDA. Essentially it has two roles, one is to look after commercial contracts with utility customers for services at Sellafield, those are primarily services associated with Thorp reprocessing and MOX fuel manufacturing and the second is looking after international transport operations, primarily maritime transport operations.
38. Mr Clarke continued that with regard to transport, four types of material are transported; spent fuel, MOX fuel, plutonium and wastes, primarily high level wastes between the UK and continental Europe and Japan.
39. INS has a subsidiary company called Pacific Nuclear Transport Ltd (PNTL) which has share holdings from INS and also from a French company and the Japanese electricity companies.
40. PNTL carries out movements between continental Europe and Japan. INS runs transport operations on behalf of its French counterparts, a company call Areva between Cherbourg and Japan as well as operations between the UK and Japan through the PNTL subsidiary.
41. It has a fleet of four ships, three associated with PNTL and owned by PNTL and one owned by the NDA. The NDA ship is used for UK related shipments between the UK and continental Europe. The three PNTL ships go to and from Japan.
42. Mr Clarke reported that those ships are in the process of being replaced as there is a policy of replacing ships after a 25 year period. A new ship was launched in Japan in May 07 as the first phase of replacing the fleet.
43. In terms of International transport Mr Clarke stressed that it was not a new operation and has been operating for 40 years, the highlights being over the 40 years that over 2,000 flasks of nuclear material has been moved over 5 million miles without a single incident involving a release of radioactivity. A safety record of which INS is proud.
44. Throughout Cumbria two ports are utilised, Barrow and Workington. Barrow sees the majority of operations via Ramsden Dock. There is a Ramsden Dock

Terminal stakeholder group which INS is an active part of and Mr Clarke reported that he had recently become a member of.

45. Workington is also utilised for the movement of MOX fuel to continental Europe.
46. Moving on to talk about INS ships, Mr Clarke commented that they are designed to the highest international standards set by both the International maritime organisation and the International Atomic Energy Agency. There is a ratings scale (INF scale), INF 3 is the highest rating, the PNTL ships are all INF 3 rating for reasons of the routes taken and the materials carried and the European ship is INF2 rated, which is a slightly lower rated ship that all meet the necessary approvals and regulations and similarly so do the flasks that are used to transport the material which are stringently tested and authorised by national and international regulators and meet all the necessary international standards.
47. In terms of transport to and from port terminals the majority of those transports are carried out by rail. INS sub contract those operations some of them are sub contracted directly through the NDA some through other parties.
48. For security reasons MOX shipments tend to be moved by road transport, in accordance with national and international requirements.
49. Mr Clarke reported that security was clearly a major issue for INS who is in very close co-operation with the Office of Civic Nuclear Security (OCNS), the Civil Nuclear Constabulary and a range of other national and international organisations. All the necessary security arrangements are met, Mr Clarke explained that it would be inappropriate to comment further on those, but did say they were extensive things, some which are visible on some of the ships.
50. In the past transport has really been associated with moving spent fuel to Sellafield. Future operations will focus on the returns of the materials from reprocessing. Mr Clarke expected in the next year or so to be moving high level wastes away from Sellafield back to Europe and Japan in accordance with contract requirements and also to be moving mixed oxide fuels to continental Europe and again to Japan and similarly mixed oxide fuels from France to Japan and wastes from France to Japan also.
51. Mr Clarke concluded that INS is committed to open dialogue, but that there were certain security issues that could not be covered in an open forum, he then offered to take any questions.
52. **Mike Davidson:** noted with interest that there had been mention of a Ramsden Dock Stakeholder Group. He asked whether there would be a place for a port of Workington stakeholder Group?
53. **David Moore:** replied that was a decision for the port of Workington. If it felt that a group was needed where information could be received from the site licence company then he felt Mr Clarke and his team would make themselves available to attend any meetings to update it.

54. **John Clarke:** confirmed that he would make himself available. He continued that historically the WCSSG was known as the Sellafield Local Liaison Committee and the Ramsden Dock sub committee was focused very much around the Barrow area. At the time of Ramsden Dock's inception the port of Workington was not in use. Whatever arrangements were made Mr Clarke would be very happy to support them.
55. **Cllr A Clarke:** reported that he was a member of the board of the port of Workington and assured members that he would inform members of the board of anything of any relevance that emerged from the WCSSG meetings.
56. **David Moore:** thanked Cllr Clark and commented that it would be quite useful if the committee had a regular update on transport issues. He stated that it would also be useful for members who had not already done so to visit the Barrow and Workington terminal should the opportunity arise.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY

57. Mark Dixon had nothing extra to add to the report that had been circulated and offered to take questions.
58. **Elaine Woodburn:** referred to the bullet point on the NDA report which read 'the funding figure is less than the plan and the works going on to prioritise, and asked how the prioritisation would be carried out. She personally felt that the NDA Chief Executive had been wrong to ask all of the SSG Chairmen if they would be prepared to ask for some of their SLC money to go into areas like Harwell and Wylfa. She felt that it was unfair to ask other sites to even consider doing that when the community had always understood that resources would go where the highest priority was and that was Sellafield because it has the biggest problems and the biggest areas that need to be decommissioned. She stressed that it was a personal feeling but she felt it was wrong to ask and she felt that there was a high risk that it could create problems between each site stakeholder group. She reiterated her question and asked how the NDA was going to look at prioritising and whether there would be any consultation with communities?
59. **Mark Dixon:** responded that the NDA would not be looking at a consultation on the way that it is prioritising. The NDA is joining with the site that carries out the work to look at the high hazard elements first and where they can place the greatest emphasis and the money on cleaning those hazards up.
60. The process is part way through at the moment. Further on from that the NDA will undertake discussions with the regulators about how regulatory issues are addressed. Expanding the process further Mr Dixon commented that the prioritisation process will look right across all of the NDA's sites, perhaps not in the way that Dr Roxburgh had intended by using the Site Stakeholder groups but by using the actual SLC's themselves and the regulatory bodies that regulate the sites. He concluded that it would be work within the SLC's rather than for consultation.

61. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked if other considerations would be taken into account apart from funding. Referring to the deferral of Calder Hall and the re-deployment of employees she asked if the loss of skills and employment would be taken into account?
62. **Mark Dixon:** commented that all those considerations would be taken into account when the site is making decisions about where best to prioritise the funds.
63. **Elaine Woodburn:** was not convinced that the skills lost by moving employees into other jobs particularly at Calder Hall were taken into consideration. She questioned whether those skills would still be available to decommission the facility in the years to come?
64. **John Clarke:** replied that it was the case that the site had re-prioritised with respect to Calder Hall by using a combination of looking at the relative hazards at Calder Hall versus other areas. The regulator has taken a view on its requirements for the condition of Calder Hall prior to certain decommissioning activities taking place and the level of funding available. As a consequence of all three of those some decommissioning projects are being deferred and about 100 employees will be redeployed to other areas on the site. Sellafield Ltd is working hard to ensure it does not lose those skills and will retain a core of people at Calder to ensure maintenance of the asset and to carry out work that is required. The remainder of the people will be redeployed elsewhere on the site to ensure skills are not lost, but it is a case of prioritising primarily against hazard and funding availability.
65. **Cllr A Clark:** stated that there had recently been an application at Lillyhall by Studsvik to decommission steel which had been granted, Cllr Clare thought that it had caused uproar in Allerdale. He continued that the problem with the nuclear industry is mainly perception and there is a feeling in other areas that if you don't have a policy of placing decommissioning on licensed sites it could blight areas. He felt it was remiss of the NDA not to have a policy because it was alleged that if the steel plant had been sited anywhere apart from Sellafield it would have caused controversy. He thought the NDA should have a policy because there could be in future a proliferation of decommissioning of steel and other material?
66. **Mark Dixon:** replied that it was Studsvik not the NDA that applied for the Lillyhall site at Workington. It had been the speculation of a contractor on a market that could possibly be available and that it might be able to gain work from it, which would happen in all industries. Mr Dixon said it was not part of an NDA policy.
67. With regard to decommissioning overall, Mr Dixon continued that one of the reasons why the NDA had ran the LLW repository competition as it had, with a second element where it would be looking for a company who on the NDA's behalf would oversee the UK LLW management right across the whole of the country, integrating it and doing it in the right place at the right time with the right amount of facilities that was why the NDA set up the competition in that

way. The Studsvik application and agreement to site the plant at Lillyhall was outside of the NDA's remit.

68. **Cllr J Clark:** asked if the NDA had any influence on the applicants?
69. **Mark Dixon:** confirmed the NDA did not have any influence on the applicants. Studsvik is an independent company that makes its own business decisions and speculates on what the markets might be able to offer it in the future and therefore turn its profit.
70. **Steve Lewis:** added that the process that had been gone through was that there was a consideration that perhaps Studsvik being an organisation that has an outlet for material that has been cleaned up and is available then to be used in the normal supply chain wanted to look at the option about whether it could be considered for some of the decommissioning materials coming out of the Sellafield site. There are a whole host of different materials of different levels of contamination of potential harm on the site arising from decommissioning so a serious review was carried out both by the NII and the Environment Agency to look at the application and he confirmed that the NDA had nothing to do with it. A speculator looked at an opportunity and wanted advice about what could or could not happen and what NII has considered in this case is that they are very very low harm materials however Studsvik has been advised that if it wishes to carry out those operations it will be required to be licensed so it will be a licensed activity.
71. **Cllr J Clark:** commented that it was the same with windmills if they are put in hide park he would believe it and if decommissioning of steel was put in Windermere he would believe it.
72. **Steve Lewis:** added that the NII had been approached through the NDA's responsibility area for discussions with the site licence company to look at all the other areas that will possibly require materials to be cleaned up and removed to make the site a safer place and there are no decisions in that area at the moment, but jointly they are looking at what will need to be done, how it is best done, the likelihood that it will be done within the confines of the existing Sellafield owned properties and therefore will come directly under the NDA's control to make it happen. Mr Lewis stressed that decisions are not made lightly and the NII would have to be certain that the amount of harm that can be done to the public is below anything that would be considered to be of concern.
73. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that the community had been consulted on the NDA's socio economic report in December 06, the draft came out in January and we are now nearly 12 months along that process. She assumed that the report was needed to influence the PBO yet nobody had seen the final document. She felt that did not give the right message to the community that the NDA sees socio economic issues as important.
74. **Mark Dixon:** assured the committee that the NDA does see socio economics as important. It is a secondary obligation on it under the energy act. Setting up the socio economic committee within the NDA with its funding and also the socio economic plan that Cllr Woodburn referred to bore testament to that. Mr Dixon

confirmed he would find out when the socio economic report was due out and would pass the date onto the committee.

75. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked how much funding was allocated to the NDA socio economic committee?
76. **Mark Dixon:** offered to source the information and circulate to members.
77. **Mr Tony Jones:** asked if the NDA or Sellafield Ltd could provide any reassurance over the future of the Sellafield Visitors Centre?
78. **John Clarke:** replied that the Sellafield Visitors Centre had gone through many changes over the years and the site was looking to change it again at the moment to utilise it as somewhere that is an exhibit for the nuclear industry and Sellafield in particular but would also act as a forum for nuclear related businesses to be attracted to and exchange views and hopefully develop ideas. There were no plans at the moment to close it.
79. **Tony Jones:** asked for confirmation that the site wouldn't be going back to tourists at North Group, and whether it would operate the Sellafield Visitors Centre with the current staffing levels?
80. **John Clarke:** could not comment on exactly what the staffing levels would be but reiterated that certainly the current plans are to maintain the Visitors Centre. Where it is placed physically and the role it will have will evolve over time to reflect both the information and educational aspects of it and also the business development aspects for the nuclear community in the area as a whole.
81. **Tim Knowles:** referred to the NDA power point slide and the bullet point - 'Now in final phase of dialogue with remaining four bidders' and asked if the NDA could confirm or if the committee could be informed at some stage in the future what precisely the involvement of stakeholders and local authorities was going to be in the specifics related to the socio economic responsibility of the successful PBO contractor, i.e.: are there going to be any hard targets about GVA, employment levels etc. placed upon the contractor as a contribution to dealing with the impact of decommissioning, i.e.: the 8000 job losses. He commented that he wasn't actually certain what the job losses are going to be because the programmes have changed so much?
82. **Mark Dixon:** commented that Cllr Knowles last statement was correct and there is still work to be done on the programmes based around the funding. With regards to the 'hard targets' Mr Dixon answered that legally the NDA has to follow European Union rules. The European Union rules on competition mean that any stipulation placed upon a bidder has to be directly concerned with the work that the contractor is being asked to do which means it is quite hard to put targets on the socio economics, i.e.: you must have a European headquarters here, you must employ so many people; that cannot be done because you impinge upon their capability to do the job when you are asking them to do something outside of the remit of the task.

83. What the NDA has done as a hurdle through the pre-qualification process is that it has asked bidders to commit that they were bought into the NDA socio economic policy and they would recognise what they needed to do from that. It wasn't a simple statement, but bidders have to demonstrate how it would be done. Further to that the NDA asked the community via a sub committee and through West Lakes Renaissance to look at what else might be on that PQQ, what things the community might want and that included the workforce via the unions. The NDA put all of those concerns and interests into the 'invitation to participate in' dialogue document and is currently going through the case study presentations from each of the bidders. The bidders submit ten, the NDA select a number at their discretion to go and view in the places where the bidders say they carried out those case studies. The NDA will also be taking members of the community to advise the NDA upon the case studies relevant to socio economics.
84. **Tim Knowles:** stated that basically the NDA was going to choose the process and select those with whom it engages and there is no right for the stakeholder community and the local authorities to have transparency on it and be engaged with the process.
85. **Mark Dixon:** responded that because of the European rules under which the NDA has to contract under, it has to maintain a high degree of competition confidentiality and because of this it tries to keep the team as tight as possible on all the documents and all of the things held within the competition facilities to ensure that the competition confidentiality is an ultimate. The NDA has tried as much as it can to involve the community without affecting the confidentiality.
86. **Martin Forwood:** wished to comment on the Swedish recycling facility mentioned earlier in the meeting. He absolutely supported what was said and thought it was a disgraceful decision by Cumbria County Council in the face of immense opposition from the biggest firms along the coast. He felt that irrespective of what the NII and the Agency had said about the low levels of radiation being dealt with, the real problem surely was that in giving the Swedish firm permission to start something completely new at Lillyhall it was setting a precedent for any other firm that might have similar intentions. He felt firms would be allowed to open anywhere in West Cumbria by simply referring to the Studsvik decision as an example as to why they should get approval.
87. **Martin Forwood:** wondered why in the NDA presentation there was no mention of the proposal that the NDA had put before what was the Department of Trade and Industry (now known as DBERR) on 'Advanced Allocation' which refers to the use of UK Plutonium in the Sellafield MOX plant. He thought it was quite a major thing to do, and wondered why the NDA had made no mention of it. He concluded that the consultation had been and gone and there had been no feedback from the NDA on it?
88. **John Clark:** responded that there was a consultation running at the moment on advanced allocations, which is associated with decoupling the precise date at which fuel is reprocessed from the making available of the products and wastes from reprocessing. It is not about doing something instead of reprocessing, it is about decoupling it timing wise. The consultation is being run by DBERR and it closed initially on the 26th July 07, it was extended due to some information that

was given out that was not actually correct. Mr Clarke continued that there were no proposals that he was aware of and it was not covered in the consultation document to change the arrangements around the Sellafield MOX plant and the use of materials through that. It is solely about decoupling the timing of reprocessing from the making available of products and wastes to enable them to be transported back to customers on a timescale that is suitable for them to use those products. Mr Clarke concluded that his understanding was that the consultation now closes on the 10th October and re-iterated that it was a DBERR consultation not an NDA consultation.

89. **Martin Forwood:** understood that and stated that CORE had obviously made a response to it. He had further questions to ask but felt they would be better placed following the Sellafield Ltd presentation. He commented that he still found it really surprising that it was an NDA proposal and there was no mention of it at all from the NDA.
90. **John Clarke:** was happy to answer any questions later on from a site perspective. He reiterated that his understanding was that it was a DBERR consultation. It had come about through discussions involving Sellafield Ltd, NDA and customers but it was a DBERR consultation.
91. **Martin Forwood:** asked if it was not an NDA proposal?
92. **John Clarke:** replied that a proposal had come from the NDA following discussions with Sellafield Ltd, utility customers and the NDA about the service that may be of benefit to all parties. He thought the key part of the consultation was that it has to be of benefit to all parties.
93. **David Moore:** commented that with regard to prioritisation where Mr Dixon had said that the NDA and the SLC would be working together, he thought stakeholders did have a role to play. The community has seen staff redeployed and Mr Moore said that people know that you cannot keep redeploying forever and the community was concerned about that. He felt that although it is up to the NDA and SLC to look at the priorities there is a need for stakeholder engagement somewhere in the process.
94. **Mark Dixon:** had responded specifically to the consultation question. He stated that he would have no problem in bringing things back to the committee and discussing it.
95. **AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM SELLAFIELD LTD**
96. The Chairman introduced John Clarke to represent the report. Prior to Mr Clarke beginning the Chairman commented on the Calder Hall Cooling Towers demolition that had taken place at the weekend. He was sure everybody would have seen it on the news or saw it live or that at least everyone would be aware that it had taken place. Mr Moore continued that the demolition had been extremely significant; it was the biggest change to the local skyline in the last 50 years. He wished to publicly say a few thanks to those people that had been involved in carrying out the work on the project. The project had been in planning for nearly three years and the end result was that the towers were

demolished safely, the weather had been kind on the day, the dust had gone off shore and there had even been rain through the night to keep the dust at a minimum. He re-iterated that it had passed off with no problems and he passed his thanks onto the project team.

97. **John Clarke:** thanked the Chairman very much for his kind remarks. He reported that Paul Brennan was in the audience. Paul had led the team that was responsible for bringing down the towers and he was sure he would pass the feedback directly to the team as would Mr Clarke.
98. Moving onto the Sellafield Ltd report Mr Clarke explained that Barry Snelson was unable to attend the meeting due to other commitments. Mr Clarke was deputising for him today in his capacity as Deputy Managing Director, Sellafield Ltd.
99. He intended to take the report as read and highlight a few issues. Mr Clarke reiterated that he was grateful to the Chairman for already mentioning the Calder Cooling Towers. He reported that all along safety had been the sites number one priority with respect to bringing the towers down, they came down flawlessly from that respect, that was the sites prime goal and it had been achieved.
100. Mr Clarke expanded on funding, he reported that the site had made some decisions with respect to Calder particularly on redeployment of staff and deferral of some work. The remainder of the site is also being looked at with respect to the amount of work that the site is required to do, the amount of work that it wishes to do, the amount of work that the regulators and the NDA and the community wants the site to do and the funds available. The site is trying to determine what is possible.
101. Some decisions have already been taken in terms of deferrals and cancellations of some work at this stage. The priority remains hazard reduction and the maintenance of safety on the site. Sellafield Ltd is looking to ensure that safety is maintained from a nuclear safety, radiological safety, environmental safety and industrial safety perspective; high levels of security as the site works on items that are of regulatory interest or maybe became of regulatory interest in the future and also revenue generating commercial operations, not only because it has contracts with utility customers and intergovernmental agreements associated with those, but because they do support revenue into the NDA which in turn supports the decommissioning activities on the site.
102. There is a hierarchy that is gone through but hazard reduction and safety management is absolutely at the top of the priorities.
103. Mr Clarke reported that the site is working through a strategic review at the moment with the NDA and regulators looking at precisely how to prioritise the work against the funds available. It is work in progress and as soon as any further information became available, Mr Clarke committed to communicating further. He believed there had been some dialogue in terms of the original prioritisation process through the national stakeholder groups through the NDA in terms of setting up where priorities are set and therefore where the funding primarily goes.

104. On operational performance, Mr Clarke reported that the MOX plant remains a challenging project for the site but it is making progress. The plant was operational at the time of the report. The current challenge that the plant is facing is associated with fuel rod manufacturing but progress is being made on that and Sellafield Ltd is aiming to deliver its contracts with a European Customer.
105. The Magnox reprocessing plant was in operation at the time of the report with 116 tonnes of fuel reprocessed this year.
106. Mr Clarke reported that the Thorp plant had been re-commissioned following the events of 2005 all the material that was held up in the plant has been removed, the site has carried out a 33 tonne re-commissioning campaign, it has demonstrated all the modifications work satisfactory, and meets all the necessary international safeguards requirements. Sellafield Ltd is about to process the material from that campaign through the chemical plants which would complete the full movement of material through the plant, following which there will be a review with regulatory bodies to ensure that the re-commissioning has met all regulatory requirements as well as meeting all of Sellafield Ltd's requirements.
107. Mr Clarke reported that the Vitrification plant, line 3 was operating at the time of the meeting, with lines 1 and 2 currently under engineering re-build having routine maintenance and some project enhancements put in place to improve reliability and throughput. To date this year 131 containers have been produced through the High Level Waste Plants.
108. With regard to the highly active evaporators associated with treating the materials from reprocessing prior to the vitrification plants, Mr Clarke reported that there are three evaporators. Evaporator A is dedicated to the vitrification plant and magnox reprocessing. It is currently shut down but the Company expect it to be operational again by the end of the year.
109. Evaporator B is very similar with the Company expecting that to be operational again next year.
110. Evaporator C which services Thorp and Magnox is currently operating on Magnox material and Sellafield Ltd is in dialogue with the regulators about bringing it back into operation for further Thorp reprocessing.
111. In terms of decommissioning. Whilst the prioritisation process is progressing, Sellafield Lt is still continuing to carry out decommissioning and clean up processes. Hazard reduction is a key activity together with regulatory compliance. Mr Clarke reported that the Company is making good progress with some of the major projects in the Ponds and Silos areas, some of the old plants associated with the 1950's and 60's and he reported that one of the old uranium purification plants is just about completely demolished with one or two minor walls standing about to go through the process of being nibbled down. Mr Clarke commented that it will be one of the first plants that have been completely dismantled from a fully active plant down to ground level.

112. The site is also engaged in construction activities, three of the major construction projects ongoing at the moment are the Sellafield Product and Residues Store, which will store plutonium oxide powders and plutonium residues, and it is a major construction project with very visible tower cranes on the site. Two other projects, the Encapsulated Product Store 3 for intermediate level waste and Evaporator D, the fourth highly active evaporator both have their initial ground works going on at the moment. So not only is the site working on decommissioning but in order to treat the materials the NDA is continuing to invest and Sellafield Ltd is continuing to discharge that investment in terms of build.
113. Mr Clarke went on to talk about safety and explained that Sellafield Ltd is continually trying to improve safety using a WANO approach. A body that came together post Chernobyl to look at how operators can learn from each other and improve standards. The site is putting a lot of emphasis on nuclear safety particularly as it is the one thing that differentiates Sellafield Ltd from other industries. A nuclear safety Champion has been appointed who is a very experienced senior operator from the site. Mr Clarke stressed that the site is constantly driving to improve safety performance not only nuclear safety, but environmental, radiological and conventional safety also.
114. Despite the efforts made Mr Clarke reported that events are happening with reference to some of them in the report. The site makes regular and open reference to those events in the Sellafield Newsletter that the communications team put out on a weekly basis, but the site strives to eliminate all of those events, the target aimed for is zero.
115. Mr Clarke concluded that it is a very challenging time for Sellafield Ltd as it is for the NDA, the regulators and for the community as a whole, but Mr Clarke informed the group that the site is committed to ensuring that focus is maintained throughout the challenging times as it leads the site through to its next phase of operations under ultimately a new Parent Body Organisation.
116. **Martin Forwood:** asked for more detail on the performance of the MOX plant. In past meetings details had been given for example of how many fuel assemblies had been made, he knew the site was manufacturing fuel and asked how many assemblies had been made to date.
117. **John Clarke:** confirmed that Sellafield Ltd had manufactured and exported 16 assemblies from the MOX plant for a European customer which completed a contractual requirement for that customer. It was moving onto another customer making a different type of fuel using some different uranium as not all MOX fuel is the same. As yet no assemblies associated with the customer's fuel have been delivered but the site is in the process of working towards delivering the fuel for them. At the moment no assemblies have been made, the component parts are being made for the assemblies. Mr Clarke concluded that assembly manufacture is actually a quick operation it is the component parts that take the time.
118. **Martin Forwood:** asked for clarification on page 2 of the report second paragraph which read 'through this period Magnox has maintained flask receipts from British Energy to support their operations' and asked if Mr Clarke could

explain that statement as he wasn't sure where Magnox and British Energy come together, with them being both totally different enterprises?

119. **John Clarke:** confirmed Mr Forwood was correct and that British Energy does not run the Magnox stations. He explained that the British Energy flasks, the AGR flasks are received into the Magnox reprocessing plant for handling to start with which is part of the Magnox suit of plants. It is there that the AGR dismantler is placed and the fuel is dismantled and moved to other storage facilities and eventually through Thorp. The statement was not meant to imply that Sellafield Ltd is receiving Magnox fuel from British Energy, but the British Energy flasks go to the plant that handles the Magnox fuel.

120. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood tested his understanding and asked if it was the fuel handling plant that has been continuing to receive the AGR fuel?

121. **John Clarke:** confirmed that was correct

122. **Martin Forwood:** then went on to ask where all the incoming British Energy Fuel is being stored, with Thorp closed now for two and half years, Mr Forwood stated that it was common knowledge before the Thorp accident that both BNFL and the NDA would say under normal conditions they would keep around 12 months of spare pond capacity for incoming AGR fuel. At the end of 12 months he asked again where the fuel was being stored. Now at 30 months Mr Forwood felt there would be storage problems, perhaps some kind of bottle neck with regards to where the incoming AGR fuel is stored. Mr Forwood went on to say that the NDA had recently given the reason for being able to deal with the situation was that there was an export facility in Thorp for disposing of some of the multi element bottles that were taking up room in the ponds, that is now behind schedule, the interim store outside Thorp which was supposed to be serviced by the Thorp export facility was clearly not in use yet. Mr Forwood asked where all the fuel is being put?

123. **John Clarke:** explained that the fuel is put in the existing storage ponds. There are three storage ponds on site that house AGR fuel, the site has always aimed to keep at least 12 months available capacity for AGR fuel and the site has been increasing the capacity by removing redundant items from the ponds (i.e.: material that doesn't need to be stored in ponds) to create additional space. The actual physical size of the ponds have not increased they are fixed and no additional storage facilities for spent fuel have been built. Capacity of the ponds or the proportion of the capacity dedicated to AGR fuel storage has been increased by putting additional storage containers and skips into the pond, new skips and containers have been purchased and progressively committed to the ponds. A multi element bottle export facility has been built, there have been some issues associated with the operation of that facility but it is getting close to operation now. A multi element bottle interim store has been built which is now up and ready so when the export facility is operational the site will be able to move material out through that. The site has been looking to move storage racks out and several storage racks have been cut up and disposed of , so capacity is being generated progressively within the ponds and the sites aim is still to keep the 12 months bufferage between reactor fuel discharge and storage space on the Sellafield Site and it is maintaining that at the moment.

124. **Martin Forwood:** asked if Mr Clarke could see a time when the site might have to inform British Energy that it cannot take any more of its fuel?
125. **John Clarke:** responded that he could. The site knows it can extend well beyond the 12 months that it has, so there is no short or medium term issue associated with servicing the AGR fleet.
126. **Martin Forwood:** asked Mr Clarke to clarify if evaporator C is currently the only evaporator available for reprocessing operations?
127. **John Clarke:** confirmed that was correct.
128. **Martin Forwood:** asked who made the decision as to whether the site will evaporate from the Magnox reprocessing plant or from Thorp?
129. **John Clark:** confirmed that decision has been agreed in discussions between Sellafield Ltd and the regulators that evaporator usage is prioritised on the basis of supporting the Vitrification plant first, supporting Magnox reprocessing second, and supporting Thorp third. It is a priority that had been decided for a considerable period and that position was maintained.
130. **Martin Forwood:** asked for clarification, on page 5 of the report regarding the defuelling of Calder Hall 2012. He asked what was going to happen to the fuel when it is de-fuelled because if the plans to close the reprocessing plant in 2012 still hold then the fuel cannot be reprocessed?
131. **John Clarke:** replied that the plan is that it will be reprocessed. The plans around Magnox reprocessing were always to aim to close by 2012 on the basis that was the time that we expected to complete the reprocessing of all the Magnox fuel. That is under review again now as a result of some of the throughput issues within the Magnox Reprocessing plant. Between Sellafield Ltd, the NDA and the regulators new programmes for fuel receipts and fuel reprocessing will be looked at and Calder will be a key part of feeding into that realignment of timescales for reprocessing.
132. **Martin Forwood:** asked if the lifetime of B205 could be extended past 2012?
133. **John Clarke:** confirmed that he thought that was likely, but that the process of working that through with the regulators and the NDA was still ongoing.
134. **Martin Forwood:** asked how that would effect the UK Government's commitment to the OSPAR recommendations over sea discharges?
135. **John Clarke:** responded that the OSPAR commitment was to reach near zero or near background discharges by 2020. The information held at present shows that the site was well within the requirements of meeting the OSPAR requirements.
136. **Martin Forwood:** commented that there are documents from BNFL that say that the 2012 closure date of B205 is directly linked to the OSPAR business.

137. **John Clarke:** confirmed the 2012 date was reached on the basis of being well away from 2020 but really driven by the economics of the existing Magnox power stations and therefore the whole economics of the Magnox fuel cycle.
138. **Martin Forwood:** Moving back to 'advanced allocation' and the use of UK plutonium, Mr Forwood did not understand why Thorp had got to a position where there isn't sufficient foreign owned plutonium reprocessed and foreign fuel to make the MOX fuel for those foreign customers. He asked where it had gone and why it could not be used and why it is suddenly necessary to resort to the use of UK plutonium?
139. **John Clarke:** explained that Plutonium has always been allocated on a basis that is decoupled from reprocessing. Because of the nature of the operations in the plant, the plutonium gets mixed so you cannot actually separate out each atom of plutonium which belonged to nation A or nation B or customer A or customer B. Plutonium is allocated on the basis of the proportions of fuel that the customers have sent and the precise contents of that fuel so that everyone gets exactly the right quantity of plutonium back. It has never been said that customers would get exactly their own plutonium back, so there is some mixing of overseas and UK fuel. The intent is that it is Thorp derived, overseas owned plutonium that is used and that remains the intention as advanced allocation moves forward.
140. **Martin Forwood:** commented that effectively it is virtual reprocessing where you don't actually do any reprocessing you just satisfy the customers' requirements by sending them back UK plutonium?
141. **John Clarke:** disagreed and stated that virtual reprocessing as he understood it is actually not reprocessing the fuel.
142. **Martin Forwood:** commented that is what the site is not doing at the moment?
143. **John Clarke:** replied that the site is not reprocessing the fuel at present but it has reprocessed the vast majority of overseas fuel and fully expects and intends to reprocess the remaining quantity of overseas fuel as soon as the plants are back into normal operations. Virtual reprocessing is to say we won't reprocess the fuel but we'll act as though we have reprocessed the fuel and we'll send back equivalent amounts of fuel. That's not what the consultation is about, the consultation is about decoupling the timing of the reprocessing from the making available of the products. There are certain customers who require plutonium back on a particular time scale for example for commercial and sometimes political reasons and the site needs to ensure that it is providing that material on a time scale that meets customers purposes, which may not be consistent with current reprocessing timescales, but the intention and requirement for the advanced allocations is that the fuel will be reprocessed and Mr Clarke noted that the consultation makes reference to if there was ever a suggestion of not reprocessing fuel that would be the subject of further consultation.
144. **Dave Mason:** wanted to pick up on a point that had been raised earlier on in the Sellafield Ltd presentation. There has been a discussion of the funding and how that does not match the plans and Mr Clarke had rightly highlighted the safety priorities on the site. Mr Mason wished to add that it is not very easy to manage

the differences between what the site planned to do and what it can afford to do. In particular moving forward into future years Mr Mason felt it represented a very significant challenge and he pointed out there had been a very useful meeting held recently to think about the strategies and priorities and the outcomes. The meeting was held between the NDA the regulators and the Sellafield Site was very useful.

145. AGENDA ITEM 8 – REPORT FROM UKAEA

146. The Chairman invited Peter Mann head of site for UKAEA at Windscale to present the report. He stated that he would as other presenters had take the report as read and draw attention to two particular topical specific issues.

147. The first issue is the restructuring through the industry and the amalgamation programme for Windscale and the second, the 50th anniversary of the Windscale Pile 1 fire.

148. On restructuring, Mr Mann reported that UKAEA has continued its programme of restructuring to fit in with the NDA's strategy for competition, which will result with the creation of separate Site Licence companies, one for Dounreay which will be known as Dounreay Site Restoration Ltd and one for the combination of Harwell and Winfrith sites to be known as Research Sites Restoration Ltd.

149. The re-licensing of Windscale to Sellafield will require Sellafield Ltd to hold three site licences. It will hold the Sellafield and Calder licence, the Windscale Licence and it will continue to hold the Capenhurst licence.

150. As part of the restructuring, UKAEA will also create a commercial arm known as UKAEA Ltd which will be a wholly owned subsidiary of UKAEA initially but is expected to be privatised in due course.

151. The remainder of UKAEA will continue as a non departmental public body focused primarily on the fusion research work at the Culham site in Oxfordshire. Most aspects of the amalgamation programme are progressing in parallel to conclude with the re-licensing of the sites on April 1st 08, however the Harwell/Winfrith programme has been extended to take account of major restructuring following the reduction of funding at those two sites, that will mean that re-licensing to create the research sites restoration ltd is expected to be several months later than the re-licensing of the other UKAEA sites.

152. Mr Mann continued that at the point at which Windscale becomes part of Sellafield Ltd the majority of staff will transfer to Sellafield Ltd, however UKAEA Ltd will be contracted to provide support for the Windscale programme under a resource enhancement contract. This form of contract has been used in a number of areas at Sellafield already and it enables key people to be provided as secondees into the licensees management team.

153. More locally Mr Mann reported that the transition project to amalgamate Windscale and Sellafield sites is progressing well. UKAEA and Sellafield Ltd have made the necessary submissions to the regulators and have each been

granted a licence instrument from NII to make the organisational changes required for re-licensing. Those changes have commenced and it is anticipated that a period of shadow working will commence on 15th October and that will continue right through to the point of re-licensing on April 1st next year. During that period the Windscale team will practice working as if part of Sellafield Ltd. Mr Mann felt it was important to emphasize that UKAEA remains responsible through that period until the licence is granted to Sellafield.

154. The regulators will be monitoring the site throughout that period to satisfy themselves that the revised arrangements are sound.
155. Moving to the area of interest currently, Mr Mann reported that the following week was the 50th anniversary of the fire in pile 1 and he personally paid tribute to the courage and commitment of the men and women who dealt with the fire and its aftermath back in 1957.
156. He commented that his Communications Manager Fee Wilson was managing a comprehensive programme of interaction with the media and other interested parties and has worked closely with the NDA and with Sellafield on the management of the programme. Fee was at the meeting and available to speak to if anybody wished to understand the details of those arrangements.
157. UKAEA is hosting media days for local, national, international and industry media as well as co-operating on the production of documentary programmes for TV and radio. The general pattern of the media days is in three parts, the first of which will provide facts and information to establish context, then a visit to the reactor including access to the charge face and a tour of the prototype testing facility at Moresby Parks.
158. Mr Mann explained that at Moresby there is a full scale mock up of part of the reactor and a prototype of a fuel and isotope removal equipment which can be seen in action. There are also videos and animation to demonstrate the methods that will be used during decommissioning and opportunities are provided for interviews with key members of the team.
159. Mr Mann commented that there was significant interest from the media and several articles had already appeared. He was pleased to report that several members of the committee had been able to visit the facility at Moresby that morning so that they could be taken through the sort of material that UKAEA is presenting to the media and other stakeholders.
160. Mr Mann extended an invitation for any members of the committee that couldn't attend that morning to attend at a future date and if they were interested to let himself or Fee know.
161. **Ron Hargreaves:** wished to make several comments. Firstly he thanked Mr Mann for the very clear statement he gave right at the beginning of the report on the future of what is happening at Windscale and UKAEA. He thought it very neatly encapsulated the issue and hoped that it would come as a complete verbatim report in the minutes for the meeting.

162. Secondly he commented how welcomed his invitation to visit the facilities at Moresby Parks were, Mr Hargreaves thought the presentation was excellent and commended it to anybody who hadn't seen it. He thought the historical detail was 'absolutely fascinating' quite apart from the hardware being developed.
163. **Chairman:** thanked Mr Mann for the report and commented that he knew that Border TV was running a programme and that there was a preview in Seascale the evening before it went on air so that the community had the opportunity to see what was in the programme. He felt this was useful because unfortunately the media do not always portray the stories as the community would like them to and it is usually quite useful especially if you live in Seascale seeing them before as the town usually features quite significantly. He wasn't sure how open that invitation was but he had noted it was in the Whitehaven News that there would be a viewing at Calder House for people the evening before it went out live. He hoped that it reflected the work that was done, as on seeing some of the previous documentaries they had shown how close we were to what could have been a major disaster and the good work that was done to avert that.
164. **ITEM 9 – REPORT FROM THE NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS INSPECTORATE**
165. Mr Lewis commented that the issued report was self standing and in itself he had nothing more to add other than the period had been a fairly passive business as usual period within NII's interface with the licensed sites.
166. He wished to report on some issues that had been dealt with in the period since the completion date of the report which would reflect some of the effort NII had been putting into the Sellafield and Windscale sites.
167. Mr Lewis started with legacy waste held in ponds and silos, which is a significant reason for NDAs existence. A significant focus for the site is to remove to a passive state as soon as possible the legacy wastes that are on the site and held within the various plants on the site and to do that as quickly as possible. An issue had arisen where the NII had concerns that the movement of the material in B30 needed to be accelerated possibly faster than the process could deal with.
168. This had been recognised by the SLC at the same time. NII's concern was that it may not have been dealt with. The need to remove the material out of B30 was more important than the need to reach a passive state as it gets the risk factor for the plant down quite quickly. Discussions between the NII working with the SLC and the NDA have resulted in an agreement that allows that to take place and NII is pleased with that interface.
169. Another area of concern for the NII is the High Level Waste Plants, there are two areas that have needed to be dealt with, the first one is the evaporators, and the evaporators themselves if not operational stall the whole process at Sellafield. The Magnox plants cannot discharge out from their process in B205, Thorp cannot discharge out from its process and it causes significant problems.
170. Mr Lewis reported that the NII is now content that there is a programme looking very carefully at the existing evaporators, looking at the ageing of the

evaporators and considering the impact of that on their safety cases to allow as quick as possible return to service of those and a great position movement is that an acceleration of both the NDA and the site licensee to actually bring forward the evaporator D manufacture build and commissioning which should help the situation greatly. It was another area of high concentration for NII but Mr Lewis believed it was a very fruitful area of work.

171. Mr Mann had already reported on the integration of the Windscale site into the Sellafield site. It is a complex process which involved bringing two licensed sites together under one organisation but in a time frame where it has to operate as two licensed sites in the early stages and much work has been done by all parties involved to ensure everyone understands what the complex situation is, what needs to be put in place to manage it safely so that both the period of transition remains safe and the end state it moves to is a safe state. Mr Lewis thought all parties were comfortable that there is a strategy to deal with this which will deliver both those two situations. So again, he was comfortable and happy that the work has been both useful and fruitful.
172. PBO competition is absorbing much of NII's time ensuring that the arrangements that go forward to transfer the ownership of the Sellafield operations delivery to the NDA actually ends up with a competitor that is able to deliver a safe operating environment. It does demand attention, it demands early engagement working together to ensure things are done and again he believed that work has been useful and fruitful and effective.
173. With regard to the funding of future operations Mr Lewis stated there was no doubt the government was severely financially challenged at the moment and best use of its money around the country has to be taken into account and has to be made sure it is effective. The NDA has the obligation to ensure that is done, the licensee has an obligation to ensure it knows what the difficulties may be and that the right solutions are chosen to bring about safe and best operation of the plan. The regulators have an obligation to ensure that issues are not missed in the process and that is taking up quite a lot of time. Mr Lewis concluded by referring to Mr Mason's earlier statement that all parties got together in a very joined up manner, the NDA, SLC and the regulators to look at the issues to determine how strategic overview can be used to drive the process and deliver the best capability. Mr Lewis believed that the meeting was a significant move forward, however there was still a long way to go.
174. **Paul McKenna:** referred to page 5 of the report regarding the HAS tanks and mentioned there were a couple of paragraphs giving some information about the status of the HAS tanks Mr Lewis had mentioned that money is best spent on things that need to be done and there was some discussion in the report of possible construction of smaller HAS tanks. Dr McKenna asked for some reassurance about the built in margin for safety with the existing tanks and in terms of probability or number of years before expenditure and money, how is that tackled?
175. **Steve Lewis:** replied that the issues that are raised in that section of the report are not issues for today or tomorrow they are issues to the future and it is more about the knowledge that people have of the ageing processes that those plants would

be subjected to given the materials they held and the assumptions made in safety cases about that. Assumptions were made in safety cases in the early days and conservatisms allowed in the safety cases to take account of the fact that people may not know as much as they thought they did at the time that the plants were constructed given that they were constructed some considerable time ago.

176. The ageing process is that some accelerated ageing is going on that we need to understand, the SLC is doing a significant programme of inspection activity to characterise that change and has taken an undertaking not to run evaporator A and B until that is understood and we know where we are going with it. We have got limitations to operations on evaporator C, the aggressive nature of material that comes out of Thorp is greater than that of the Magnox plant and therefore the decision to utilise evaporator C on the Magnox plant and the arisings that come out of the Vitrification process are two fold, one is to keep the process of reduction of hazard reduction associated with the Magnox material which has a higher potential for difficulties over time and the second thing is it reduces the amount of challenge that is on the plant until it is better understood.
177. Nothing can be done immediately as we need to know what is happening, but the NII does not worry about it immediately because it is content that its technical specialists have worked very closely with the licensees technical specialists and it is content that there is time to think the way through the problem, the difficulties with all of these is that when you want to make some decision to build something new given the number of years to manufacture and then install and then commission to bring it into operation, so its about making decisions early. The short term answer is there was an agreement to build an evaporator D to deal with that programme and that has been accelerated by NDA to bring it forward, then you start to look at the relationship between the HAS tanks and their capability and the evaporators and it might be appropriate, if the information that comes out about the investigations into the current HAS suggest there is a new build it may be to actually link up a separate evaporator and some smaller HAS that would be less challenged and easier to operate in parallel, a decision that has to be made in the future based on the knowledge taken in the near time. So to reassure the committee there is not an issue for today, the time scales to actually think this problem through sensibly and determine what the outcomes are is there and the right decisions will be made.
178. **Paul McKenna:** asked that in a hypothetical situation if one specific tank had to be emptied could that be done. Can it be transferred to a spare capacity tank.
179. **Steve Lewis:** responded that there was a complexity to that, there is spare tank capacity so certainly within the short term materials can be moved from one tank to another. There are certain tanks that are in key positions for feeding material onwards into the vitrification process and therefore the considerations about how they play their part and there are certain tanks that hold material perhaps that are riskier than other materials (he used risk as a relative relationship rather than as a concern) and therefore the balance of that will need to be judged, he believed there was capability to do something in the short term but in the longer term there may be a necessity to bring some extra capability.

180. **John Clarke:** clarified that he thought the original question was about spare cooling capacity in the HAS. Typically the High Active Storage tanks have about seven times the amount of cooling capacity that they need so there is a huge amount of redundancy built in and the failures that have been seen have only marginally gone into that spare capacity so there is a lot of redundancy there.
181. The site has been looking at a different design of storage tanks called a passively safe design of storage tank that doesn't rely on active cooling. That has been going on for some time as well and is part of a continuing programme of review of the storage of high active liquors rather than something that has suddenly happened.
182. **Martin Forwood:** referred to page 4 of the report regarding the highly active liquor specifications, their review and their reissue. He asked when they were going to be re-issued and whether the public would have access to the document?
183. **Steve Lewis:** replied that re-issue would be subsequent to the work that needs to be done to consider the impact of not reprocessing through Thorp. Once that is completed there will be a new document issued and pended to the NII report.
184. **ITEM 10 – REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**
185. Mr Mayall intended to highlight a few issues from the circulated report.
186. Mr Mayall highlighted the enhanced beach monitoring that has been carried out over the last 12 months. He had reported at a previous scrutiny meeting on the EA requirement to see the techniques applied by Sellafield to beach monitoring improved and this was in line with a general ongoing requirement at all nuclear sites to apply the best techniques for environmental monitoring.
187. He had at the previous meeting reported on the outcome of two one week trials which were held; one in November 06 and the other in February 07 using an array of radiation detectors mounted on a small vehicle which traverses the beach. Following the success of those trials a more routine type programme began in May 07 carried on into June and resumed again in September.
188. The areas covered so far in the programme lie between Seascale and St Bees with the primary focus being mainly on the areas close to Sellafield. The EA's April to June report reported in detail on the results up to the end of June and Sellafield Ltd has placed a report on its website providing more details of the results.
189. In summary, Mr Mayall stated that it was not surprising that the new equipment had found some radioactive items, some of which were buried at depth in the sand, and it was not surprising it had occurred given the history of the area i.e.: the beach incident in 1983 for example.
190. According to the latest set of data which is published on the Sellafield website, in total the area covered so far including the two trials is about 70 hectares of beach, which relates to about 140 football pitches. So far there have been about 130 finds of various radioactive stones, pebbles and small particles most of which

have been found close to the Sellafield site itself, but there have also been some finds at Braystones, Seascale and a few near St Bees.

191. The levels of radioactivity on the items found so far are below the levels which would give rise for concern in the unlikely event that one was to stick on ones skin for a length of time or if one was accidentally swallowed, therefore the Health Protection Agency, who the EA has been in consultation with, has said that there is no need for any special precautionary action with regard to access to, or use of the beaches and that advice was issued in July 07.
192. Mr Mayall reported that all the agencies and interested parties will keep the issue under constant review and there is a range of further work planned and in progress to build a more complete picture of the issue and also to reduce some of the uncertainties.
193. In addition to the more technical aspect to the work Mr Mayall commented that there may well be a need to review the issue on a regular basis on a more local/political level and perhaps it might be a role that the WCSSG or one of the sub committees could take on to keep the issue under review.
194. In terms of future activities, there are a range of activities planned. The monitoring will continue and is set to expand and there is a range of research and development activities planned.
195. Mr Mayall went on to highlight the EA's involvement in the process of the transfer of Windscale across to Sellafield. EA had received a joint application from Sellafield and Windscale in July 07 for the transfer of the Radioactive Substances Act authorisation, and EA is currently assessing that and will carry out a statutory consultation on it in the near future.
196. The shadow working period starts in October and EA will be involved together with NII in inspections to ensure that the new arrangements are working satisfactorily prior to the actual transfer of the authorisation next April 08.
197. With regard to the discharges of radioactive waste to sea, Mr Mayall reported that the discharges have been declining generally for some time and is now at a point where the total Alpha radioactivity and total Beta radioactivity discharges are below the UK strategy targets for 2020 - so those two targets for 2020 have already been met.
198. Likewise the target on radiation dose to the most exposed people from current discharges has also been met, the dose being now less than 20 microsieverts per year from current discharges. Mr Mayall explained that there were a number of reasons for this primarily there have been low reprocessing rates in recent years which has contributed to the reduction but also various minimisation work has been carried out on site to apply the best means to reduce discharges. Over the coming years there are several factors that will come together to possibly cause the discharges to creep back up slightly again, i.e.: reprocessing rates may go back up, clean up work will perhaps contribute to an increase and possibly prolonged fuel storage may make a contribution, at the moment however, the

signs are very promising and the EA is working with the Company and others to ensure that the current progress is maintained.

199. In conclusion Mr Mayall reported that the EA has also been involved assisting the NDA with the PBO competition process to ensure that all of the prospective bidding organisations are absolutely clear what the EA's expectations are as an environmental regulator not only for environmental performance now but also environmental performance and the prevention of impact in the medium and longer term.
200. **Ron Hargreaves:** referred to groundwater monitoring and asked if there was any data that the committee could see relevant to it. The committee constantly hear that it is being measured. Mr Hargreaves was particularly interested in what sorts of rates are there of movement of water, what sorts of levels of activity and what are the specific isotopes. Page 4 of the EA's report stated that 'eventually they will take over as the major source of release' and Mr Hargreaves had no feel whatsoever for just how big that was and wondered if there were any reports he could refer to?
201. **Andy Mayall:** confirmed that there was some data published in the SLC annual monitoring report. EA and the Food Standards Agency also produce some data in a joint annual report, in addition to that the EA is pressing the company to publish more data on its groundwater monitoring programme because it feels that there has been some good progress made in extending the network of monitoring and it should be reported. In terms of the radionuclides involved the radionuclides which have been detected in groundwater off the site are not unexpectedly the more mobile species i.e.: tritium and technetium 99. The tritium activity in ground water going off site has been known about for quite some time and has been reported annually by the Company and others. In terms of the issue related to results agreement, the EA this year in conjunction with the Company has instigated a check monitoring programme, so not only does the Company carry out a comprehensive monitoring programme of its own, EA carry out a duplicate as way of checking and verifying data and it is that programme that is quite new and the EA hopes to be publishing data on that in one of its annual reports, hopefully next year. Because it was a new process there were some discrepancies in laboratory protocol which led to some small differences in results and those have been resolved now and there is a good agreement between the check programme and the Company's own programme.
202. **John Clarke:** confirmed that Sellafield Ltd did publish data and had significantly increased the amount of monitoring frequency and number of locations over recent times and were happy to make that information available through its own websites and through the reports that the EA and the FSA make.
203. **Ron Hargreaves:** commented the reports would be very helpful, he had not seen any reference to it published in a document which he conceded could be his own lack of awareness.
204. **John Clarke:** confirmed there was certainly something on the website.

205. **Shirley Williams:** offered to direct in the minutes where to find the documents, and made the committee aware that Sellafield Ltd is looking to dedicate part of the website to contaminated land and associated issues so that people can go to that area for updated information.
206. **Sue Brown:** referred to page 15 where there was reference to metal being moved to the LLW repository at Drigg. She asked if the metal was unexpected? She then referred to the wording 'there weren't really the facilities for temporary storage or decontamination', she presumed that referred to the Sellafield site. She then asked if further metal was expected to be found and identified as LLW and what impact that would have on the LLW site. Cllr Brown added that with regards to 'the adequacy of maintaining arrangements etc., equipment and systems' she would have liked to have seen in the report whether the EA had in fact found them to be satisfactory or not whatever that outcome had been?
207. **Andy Mayall:** replied to the first point that it is part of EA's work on the site to try to encourage the prevention of waste and secondly to minimise it, in other words to apply the waste management hierarchy. Whenever any waste stream is produced EA looks to whether it can be recycled or minimised. In this particular case it was looking to see whether the Company could avoid sending the waste to the LLWR recognising that the capacity of the facility is limited.
208. This is one example of an instance where an assessment was carried out as to whether there was an alternative way of dealing with the material and undoubtedly there will be more low level metal waste produced. Some of the low level metal waste on the site is being decontaminated in an on-site facility and the committee had already heard about the facility at Studsvik which is a controversial one but the role of that facility again, partly, will be to reduce the pressure on the LLW repository at Drigg. So as the report stated, the waste will be going to the LLW repository in this case but hopefully in future as the waste management systems on the site are developed there will be some alternative means of dealing with this type of waste.
209. In relation to the second point the inspection was planned as a result of the recent transfer of the authorisation from Sellafield Ltd to the new Low Level Waste Repository Company as a way of checking whether the new Company is complying with the authorisation. It wasn't in response to any particular specific concerns but Mr Mayall could see Cllr Brown's point about the outcome. The inspection had only recently been held and Mr Mayall did not know the full output of the inspection but committed to let Cllr Brown know.
210. **Shirley Williams:** commented that there was a second advert in the Whitehaven News on a series of workshops that Sellafield Ltd is holding over the next few months looking at options for dealing with LLW arisings from the site particularly from decommissioning and inviting stakeholder input into the decision making process. The aim of all these processes is to minimise the amount of waste that needs to be sent to the repository. The first meeting is taking place on the 2nd November 07 at St Bees Management Centre.

211. **Cllr A Clark:** asked with regards to Studsvik whether the Environment Agency would have any input into monitoring the Studsvik site at Lillyhall. He also asked if Studsvik was a member of the consortium at Drigg?
212. **Andy Mayall:** confirmed that the Environment Agency would be involved in monitoring the Studsvik facility because if it possesses an authorisation under the Radioactive Substances Act then it will be subject to EA monitoring and inspection.
213. **Cllr A Clark:** asked if Studsvik could redirect steel from the Sellafield site to Workington or visa versa?
214. **Andy Mayall:** responded that if it was in the terms of the relevant transfer authorisations, then yes they could and the EA would be monitoring that process.
215. **Steve Lewis:** added that there had been nothing issued to Studsvik yet that gives them the permission to carry out the work and prior to receiving any permission to carry out work it will have to submit the appropriate documentation to demonstrate it is safe and the impact on the environment is acceptable. That process will be a visible process. Mr Lewis did not want people assuming that at this stage there is agreement given for that to go ahead.
216. **Ron Hargreaves:** referred to page 13 of the report regarding making cuts in plant spending on asset care, he felt that sounded like reduced maintenance and stressed that care must be taken not to build up problems for the future by cutting back on essential and important things now. It had happened once long ago and had caused untold problems. He asked for some assurances?
217. **Andy Mayall:** responded that some of the issues were related to funding and it was an issue that all the key stakeholders were concerned about and they are working together to try and find a solution.
218. **John Clarke:** felt it was a very well made point, and commented that it is very easy to cut maintenance and state you have made savings. Sellafield Ltd is acutely aware that the last thing you want to do is to take the short term easy solution to a longer term problem. It is a case of balancing the issues across the whole piece and the site is working it through with the NDA and the regulators to ensure the best outcome that it can to balance the work scope with the funds available. He stressed that it was certainly not into just cutting maintenance.
219. **Tim Knowles:** referred to page 8 regarding end states for the Low Level Waste repository and asked what EA's perception of the options for end states are and what its regulatory standards are. He commented that the reason for the question was that at Forsmark in Sweden Low Level Waste is packaged and disposed of in a deep geological store, obviously the newer standards, the engineered vaults at the LLW repository are to a high quality although they are surface disposal, however half the site is tumble tipped historical waste with uncertain levels of documentation and uncertainty about what is actually down there. If talking about end states for the LLW repository Cllr Knowles asked if it was not time to reconsider whether the decade long period of tumble tip disposal was remotely acceptable for the basis of end states?

220. **Andy Mayall:** replied that the EA had recently reviewed the authorisation for the repository and that was one of the issues that was raised i.e. the fact that it was those particular parts of the site which was contributing the most to post closure risk, which is the risk to future generations following closure of the site. As a result of that there was a requirement put on the operating company to review the safety case for the whole site but particularly on that part of the site and to look at options for possible remediation of that part of the site. Mr Mayall couldn't say at the moment what the current state is of that work, but agreed that Cllr Knowles was right and that it was certainly an area for focusing attention.
221. **John Clarke:** did not know the specific current progress but reported that it had been a live topic of debate for a long time since the first post closure safety case for LLW was being developed. He thought it was subject to continual review as to what was the right thing to do with the tumble tip waste. When he was last involved with it the position was that leaving it where it was was the currently favoured model but it was still being kept under review. Obviously it is some considerable time away from it reaching a final decision.
222. **Tim Knowles:** added that at Harwell the NDA decided to fund the recovery of the tumble tip waste, package the waste and send it to LLW in order to ensure an optimal 'end state' for Harwell. He hoped that would be considered when discussing the issue.
223. **Mark Dixon:** added that it would be one of the criteria that NDA will measure against to look for the new PBO for the LLWR, the ability to enhance the capability of producing a post closure safety case which involves looking at the best solution for the trench area.
224. **Martin Forwood:** referred to the beach monitoring and commented that the monitoring equipment is clearly the most sophisticated system yet used in beach monitoring but he thought it didn't pick up alpha radiation. He asked if that was correct?
225. **Andy Mayall:** replied that that was not strictly the case and that the equipment can detect some of the gamma emissions emitted by some alpha emitters so it is able to pick up Americium for example which is a low energy gamma emitter. A future part of the work programme is that the EA has required the Company to look at enhancing the equipment even more to improve the detection of alpha and some of the low energy beta emitters as well and that work is ongoing.
226. **Martin Forwood:** felt the work would be welcomed but in its absence it raised the question what has been missed in past years that this machine is now picking up it also raised the question as to whether the Environment Agency and the Health Protection Agency is not perhaps a bit premature in saying that everything is fine on the beaches when there are no alpha particle measurements to hand when there are certainly many more items found because of the more sophisticated monitoring system and because some of the levels found are getting a little bit higher as stated in the EA report. The third question it raised was whether the EA thought there was a time coming where maybe there should be some signs erected in certain places on beaches where there are either a large number of finds found or the levels of those finds are relatively significant?

227. **Andy Mayall:** taking the latter point first responded that it would not be a decision for the Environment Agency by itself to take; it would involve many agencies and interested parties and perhaps it was something that the Chairman could answer.
228. In terms of the alpha question, Mr Mayall stated that Americium is often associated with plutonium so the monitoring is able to detect plutonium through that route. The EA has recently agreed for the Company to reduce the transit speed of the machine so as to lower the detection limit for Americium, but there will obviously be a need to improve on the detection efficiency.
229. As the current position stands there is no health protection issue but the EA is keeping that under constant review with others.
230. **David Mason:** added that Martin had questioned whether he could obtain any reassurance over previous monitoring techniques and one of the things that has been very interesting and gives a degree of confidence is that the site did some early trials using the surface technique with its own monitors and there was good cross correlation with the more sensitive technique for the materials that you can find on the surface. Where this sensitive technique is really good is that it can detect things below the surface and that is where things are being found. The thing about below surface particles on the sea shore is that the sea shore changes dramatically with the tides and the condition of the sea, so you don't always see things in the same place again if you are going back to monitor them. It has been confirmed that with the surface monitoring it has been very accurate in the past, what is being found now with the more sensitive technique are materials below the surface.
231. **David Moore:** added that the community appreciate the increased monitoring that is taking place. It is not something that the community is frightened of. Anything that goes towards making the beaches a safer place can only be welcomed. He felt it was important how the information is handled and it would go through the Environmental Health sub committee, who will check the information. He felt the information needed to be released in a careful manner because he felt there was the possibility of doing a lot of harm to the communities along the beach unnecessarily. He also felt the community needed to take the right advice from the Health Protection Agency and that had given very clear guidance that there were no issues. He continued that a lot of the particles that have been found have been quite small they have probably been there a long time and it is right and proper that they are found but it is also right and proper that the information is handled carefully. He stressed that it is not the case that the community is trying to hide any information, but it should be handled in the right manner and he thought that talk of putting signs up on the beaches was very premature, particularly as there is no evidence that there is any harm to health. He thought that the monitoring should continue to take place and thanked Andy and his colleagues for the work they are doing and Professor Haywood's committee which look very closely at the results and are able to break them down into layman's language.
232. **Martin Forwood:** understood the Chairman's position however as an environmental pressure group Mr Forwood did get a significant number of

enquiries, and had had discussions with a large number of holiday makers who would often say that had they known there was radioactive material irrespective of the levels they wouldn't have gone on the beach. He felt that the whole point of signs is that you actually offer holiday makers, the general public and tourists the option as to whether they go on the beach or not especially if they have young families; that was the point he was making.

233. **David Moore:** Re-iterated that it depended how the information is put. There is one way of putting out information which is the right way and there is a scaremongering way and signs in his view did not offer a context, they would simply say there could be finds made on the beach. Although that may be factual it does not actually reflect what the main issues are and he felt that it had to be handled carefully because of the communities that live along the beaches. He felt it needed to be handled sensitively and he had already said that the information would be handled as it emerged. The Environment Agency would not have it any other way, the information would be public information but it would need to be handled in the correct manner.

234. **Professor Haywood:** offered a simple analysis of the evidence provided by the intensified monitoring programme. He noted that there had been more finds and that these had been assessed by the Health Protection Agency as posing no threat to the health of beach-goers. The intensified programme therefore provides evidence that the previous monitoring programme did NOT overlook significant risks to beach-goers.

235. **ITEM 11 - REPORT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE**

236. Professor Haywood reported that sub committee held its spring meeting on the last day of May and the draft minutes of that meeting were included in the reports to this meeting so his intention was to mention one or two items.

237. With regards to beach monitoring, the sub committee did receive reports of the early results of the intensified beach monitoring programme but as it had been fully discussed at length Professor Haywood had nothing further to add.

238. At the spring meeting the committee receives a preliminary report on the Site Operator's programme which measures Sellafield related activity in the environment. For 2006 it was estimated that the small group of consumers with a very high seafood intake received a dose of 202 microsieverts and that was down slightly from 205 in 2005.

239. This group comprises of members of the public most exposed to Sellafield discharges and the dose arises mainly from historic discharges, Professor Haywood commented that the fall was attributable mainly to changes in the consumption habits of the consumers. A more detailed report is anticipated at the sub committee's next meeting on 29th November and comparable reports from regulators should also be available at that time.

240. The sub committee received a presentation from Mr Neil Marsland on a virtual plant model used to plan the overall effluent strategy for 100 process plants and

26 radionuclides on the Sellafield site. This predicts that presently planned operations will enable the site to meet the UK discharge strategy target earlier than the 2020 deadline. The WCSSG had already heard from other items that the target has already been met but that doesn't cover all the planned operations. So the virtual plant model is predicting that the target will be met.

241. **Paul McKenna**: referred to page 8 of the report where there was a brief comment from the Chairman of the sub committee regarding the pressure on maintaining membership and attendance at the sub committee. This is related to another topic which has come before the committee in relation to the NDA making available perhaps resource or funding that would assist the sub committees maintaining a good level of attendance or membership, he asked if there was any scope for action in that regard?
242. **Prof Haywood**: Was not certain whether making resources available would make any difference to the organisations that had not been well represented and the sub committee had not discussed it.
243. **David Moore**: commented that the engagement processes with the NDA is currently under review so there is an opportunity to feed into that. If it was felt that some people were precluded because they were not being refunded their transport or travel costs and if there was anything that could be done to assist that he was sure that it could be fed into the process to be looked at.
244. **Janine Allis-Smith**: referred to press awareness which had been raised several times at the Environmental Health sub committee, but it also applied for the main meeting. By chance she had found out the Whitehaven News claimed it was not aware yesterday (3rd October) that the meeting was taking place. She felt it was important that if the main committee decides not to put adverts in the local papers at least the local media of all the papers should be informed so that if members of the public do not attend then at least the media has a chance to inform people.
245. **David Moore**: responded that the committee had been operating to a regular schedule for some time now and the meetings were all on the calendar of events which highlighted meetings 12 months ahead. He did not feel there was a need to go to the additional cost of advertising locally. The calendar of events is distributed round all the local households, all members are given a copy of the calendar and it is also available on the website. He felt it was an unnecessary cost to regularly advertise to people who already know the meetings are taking place.
246. **Janine Allis-smith**: felt that a call to some of the local journalists would be worth it and would not cost a great deal.
247. **Shirley Williams**: responded that she would take the comment on board and was surprised that the Whitehaven News was not in attendance as it is usually at the meeting. She offered to ring Alan Irving personally.
248. **David Moore**: responded further and said that he did know that the Whitehaven News had a calendar of events and thought it was down to them whether it is passing on the information to journalists, but they certainly have the information.

249. **Janine Allis-Smith:** responded that it was not in their book.

250. **David Moore:** stressed that perhaps that was their fault and not the WCSSG's.

251. ITEM 12 – REPORT FROM EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

252. The Chairman presented the report and began by taking the report as read. The sub committee had received a full report on the emergency exercises that had taken place and had been informed of the full calendar of forthcoming exercises. No significant issues arose out of the exercises that had been held.

253. Moving on to part four of the report the Chairman wished to report on the sounding of the site siren. He reported that after much debate and comment about using 'second world war technology' to warn the site and the public in the event of an emergency, there was now a new site siren system. He welcomed that as it was something the committee had pushed for; he hoped some of the pressure extended by the stakeholder groups had played a part in the change.

254. He explained that when the new householder leaflet is distributed it will include a free phone number which if rang will explain the current status of the site. If at any time, the community has concerns or if the siren is heard the free phone number can be rang to hear the current status of the site. The Chairman explained that the committee would welcome people testing the phone line when the company is running exercises on the site.

255. The sub committee had been given a short brief on the lessons learnt from Buncefield and although some people may have thought it was not very relevant, it was the biggest fire since the Second World War and the issues for emergency planning were great. One thing that the Chairman praised was most of the recommendations that came out of the Buncefield incident had already been taken on board by the site and were already part of the emergency arrangements.

256. He continued that the recovery issues were on a national level. He reported that David Humphreys sits on the committee that is looking at that and there had been some issues regarding nuclear matters. The sub committee has offered him the full support at any time when he requires it for any issues they are looking at.

257. ITEM 13 – REPORT FROM WINDSCALE SUB COMMITTEE

258. Ranald Stewart reported that the Windscale sub committee held its last meeting on 5th September 07 and the minutes were available on the WCSSG website.

259. All items within the report had been reported on by previous presenters in earlier agenda items so Mr Stewart had nothing further to add.

260. He thanked Peter Mann, his colleagues and staff for the presentation at the Windscale Pile decommissioning facility at Moresby Parks. He had found it most informative and educational particularly on the technology being developed.

261. Mr Stewart concluded by saying he was pleased to read within the UKAEA report on the Windscale transition project which aims to amalgamate the Windscale site with the Sellafield site that it is progressing positively. He reported that the positive approach is apparent when speaking to members of the staff and thought it was good to see as it was one of the concerns at the very beginning of the project that there was too much uncertainty, He felt that had now been resolved.

262. ITEM 14 – REPORT ON LOW LEVEL WASTE SUB COMMITTEE

263. Cllr Brown had very little to add to the report that had been circulated and wished to highlight one or two points. The LLW sub committee was planning to hold an extra meeting in October which at the time of the report was unscheduled and undated. The purpose of the meeting is to meet formally the new Parent Body Organisation. The meeting would be open to the public.

264. With regards to Vault 9, Cllr Brown reported that the application was intended to go before Cumbria County Council development control and regulation committee in October. That date had been put back to November for a reason unknown to Cllr Brown.

265. The sidings that had already been given permission has been put on hold until the application on Vault 9 has been decided.

266. Cllr Brown reported that the LLW sub committee had held a joint meeting with the emergency planning sub committee and the proposals from that meeting are still being consulted on. Cllr Brown had no concrete proposals to report but was hopeful that there would be something to report at the next meeting.

267. With regard to the announcement over the community benefit package, Cllr Brown commented that there is still quite a lot of discussion ongoing and she understood that senior councillors were meeting to discuss it and take it further. She felt there were quite a few complicated issues over the community package, but felt she could rely on the leaders to see the committee through.

268. She concluded that she would like to see the new PBO at the next WCSSG meeting to give a management report.

269. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented on the community package, she knew that both CBC and CCC were disappointed in the news that had been received at the sub committee and felt extremely let down and disappointed by both the NDA and the government on the issue. She thought there were wider implications that the NDA and government needed to take into consideration and ensure that this is done correct and in the best interest of the community. With regard to the negotiations on the downgrading of the site security arrangements, she asked if Cllr Brown could give an update on that and finally she asked with regard to the road show that was held in May, where the report mentioned that concerns are being addressed in the application documentation, she asked if they have or they haven't?

270. **Sue Brown:** replied that there are still concerns from the villagers and at the last meeting those were expressed by the public. Cllr Brown's response to that was that she would take those points, mainly over noise and pollution to the development control and regulation panel, she thought that was as much as she could do. They had been addressed initially and will be addressed again at the panel meeting. Cllr Brown was very surprised about the community package deal not being quite what was expected.
271. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that she thought it would be what was expected, although it may take a little longer.
272. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked about the concerns about the downgrading of site security arrangements. Someone had mentioned earlier in the meeting about the perception you get from having a nuclear site. She was slightly worried that there hadn't been an output of the negotiations and the clock was ticking for the new PBO to start.
273. **David Moore:** clarified that the PBO is tied into the arrangements that are currently there. He thought the NDA committed to that at the time.
274. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked Mark Dixon how long the PBO would be tied into the current arrangements?
275. **Mark Dixon:** confirmed only until any consultation that agreed a reduction in the level of security. There is no fixed time at all.
276. **David Moore:** confirmed with Mr Dixon that what he was saying was that it would be part of a consultation?
277. **Mark Dixon:** confirmed that was correct.
278. **Sue Brown:** confirmed that her understanding was there would be a consultation. Her understanding was that there are more concerns probably from the local community and the villagers than the site alone and felt that they have to be very much involved in the process.
279. **Ron Hargreaves:** felt the last point was extremely important, he thought the views of the villagers should be very very strongly represented as consultees with clout rather than simply people that are adding an opinion which can then be overruled by higher opinion. He thought it was very important that the consultation should be a proper, thorough and responsible consultation.
280. **Cllr A Clark:** commented on the community packages and grants and thought the NDA was being encouraged to be a benevolent society and he thought there were bigger problems to face than giving little bits of grants out. He continued that there was a letter in the Whitehaven News by his colleague that he advised the committee to read. The letter was arguing that we seem to think in West Cumbria the Nuclear Industry is going to be macabre like and something will turn up and there won't be this catastrophe. He was generally concerned and felt there was going to be a catastrophe if we didn't work with the NDA and the government to provide a diversification of industry in West Cumbria. He didn't

think the nuclear industry had all the answers. He knew local councillors put pressure on organisations with a good deal of money but he implored the NDA to use money very wisely and try and diversify the economy in West Cumbria rather than everyone sending begging letters. That wouldn't cure the problem. He advised the NDA not to become a benevolent society and to try and diversify the economy in West Cumbria because it most certainly needed it.

281. **Mark Dixon:** responded that the socioeconomic fund is there for sustainable issues for jobs for the future it isn't a benevolent fund. The NDA socioeconomic fund is aimed at exactly those things that Cllr Clark was talking about. Lined up with all of the other initiatives ongoing throughout the county to look at the sustainability of future employment.
282. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that part of the diversification happens to be Studsvik.
283. **David Moore:** did not wish to get into a political debate and commented that the issues were around the community benefits package and however it is looked at it is not looked at as a benevolent fund, it was looking at long term sustainability. That is why it is a community package it doesn't look at just this week or this year it is something that is being put together to recognise the community in Drigg that has put up with something for 50 years and also to allow them to build for the future.
284. **Tim Knowles:** was really rather concerned about the issue and rather concerned at the way Cllr Brown had reported it. He continued that there is Vault 9 which is way behind programme with all the implications that has, there has been a first class attempt to ensure that the community is brought on board and there is proper stakeholder consultation with regard to this so the application can be progressed, he felt it was a very important project which has enormous implications for the industry. He then commented that the NDA cannot deliver the promised community package because it has failed to do due diligence within government with the treasury to ensure they can actually pay out what they have promised. Now everyone is desperately trying to resolve the problem by coming up with a different sort of package to enable that to accompany the planning application so that the planning application has a chance of success because the consultations with stakeholders and the community have all been about that. So the community now finds itself in some difficulty and he was surprised that Cllr Brown in his opinion had taken such a rather back peddling approach to it. It is a real problem that effects the industry and he felt that if this is the way in which Socio economic issues are going to be handled, if this is an example of the competence of handling these things in relation to crucial problems he would be very concerned and he would have thought Cllr Brown would be also as Chair of this sub committee.
285. **David Moore:** in response stated that was one of the reasons for setting up a socio economic sub committee so that socio economic packages can be clearly scrutinised and dealt with. He thought that in fairness to Cllr Brown, he had been at the meeting and the information that was given at it was reflected in Cllr Brown's report. There had been very limited information given from the NDA at

the meeting and a lot of what was being discussed today had come to light since that particular meeting.

286. **Sue Brown:** commented that was absolutely correct, there hadn't been an awful lot of information and as she had said earlier she was quite surprised when presented with it. She was also hoping that the new socio economic group would take on board the issues with relation to the LLW repository site as well as the issues over Sellafield and that possibly there were lessons to be learnt about what the NDA and government can and cannot do.

287. ITEM 15 – REPORT ON CALDER HALL SUB COMMITTEE

288. Ranald Stewart presented the report as Norman Clarkson was unable to attend the meeting, there was little to add to the circulated report as much of its contents had been discussed during earlier items on the agenda.

289. He endorsed the congratulations to Paul Brennan and his team for the successful demolition of the cooling towers and congratulated Calder Hall on being successful in achieving its fourth RoSPA gold medal.

290. ITEM 16 – DATES AND VENUES OF NEXT MEETING

291. The Chairman confirmed that there would be a special meeting on 14th November to look at the site end states. (Note from secretariat – meeting to take place at Cleator Moor Civic Hall at 1300hrs). The Chairman confirmed it would be open to the press, public and invited consultees who had attended the previous workshops that were run. Observers were also welcome.

292. The date of the next event of the WCSSG is on January 3rd 08 – venue and format to be advised.

293. The next full scrutiny meeting will be April 3rd 08 at Whitehaven Civic Hall. With that the Chairman closed the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.