

**MINUTES OF THE 2nd SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT WHITEHAVEN CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 06 APRIL 2006**

Present:

Cllr T Johnston	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr P Tyson	-	Whitehaven and District Trades Council
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mr J Murdock	-	GMB Union
Mr A Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Mr S Lewis	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr P Watson	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr M Dixon	-	NDA
Mr D J Harris	-	Cumbria Nuclear Constabulary
Mr D Mason	-	British Nuclear Group Sellafield Limited
Mr B Snelson	-	British Nuclear Group Sellafield Limited
Mr D Moore	-	Chairman
Ms S Williams	-	Secretariat
Prof J Haywood	-	Regional Medical Physics
Mr P Mann	-	UKAEA
Mr N Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr Colin Hill	-	Sellafield Churches Forum
Mrs L McDevitte	-	St Bridgets Parish Council
Mr T Jones	-	Prospect
Prof S Jones	-	Westlakes Research Institute
Mr F Duffy	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr J McVay	-	Fire and Rescue
Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Dr J Vickers	-	North Cumbria Primary Care Trust
Mr P Daley	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr D Cook	-	Drigg Parish Council
Mr R Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the 2nd 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 there were 4 exits in the hall and the roll call area was in the car park.
2. He asked everyone to sign the register at the back of the room that was provided to account for everyone in the event of a role call.
3. He asked presenters to highlight only one or two items from the report or to report on anything that had happened since the distribution of the report. The reports had been distributed in adequate time for members to read and had been available on the website, in local libraries and local council offices.

4. The Chairman welcomed all observers to the meeting and reminded members to sign the register being circulated around the table. He welcomed two Swedish visitors who were visiting as part of a delegation meeting their counterparts in our Country.

AGENDA ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. Moving onto agenda item 1, the Chairman reported that a number of members had been unable to attend the meeting and had sent representatives. The Chairman welcomed all the representatives to the meeting. He particularly mentioned the absence of Cllr Elaine Woodburn who had recently been involved in a road accident and was unable to attend the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 06 OCTOBER 2005

6. Moving onto agenda item 2, the Chairman asked if there were any amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 6th October 05. There were no amendments required.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF 1st MEETING

7. There were no matters arising.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – NDA STRATEGY

8. The Chairman noted that reports were usually available in the public domain 10 working days before the meeting, however, due to Ministerial constraints the NDA was unable to meet this target and no report had been made available. He introduced Mr Mark Dixon to update the committee.
9. Mr Dixon apologised for the fact that the report was not available prior to the meeting. Ministerial approval was not given until the 31st March and the NDA was not authorised to release anything prior to that time.
10. The strategy is now available on the website and hard copies would be made available for public consumption upon request.
11. Mr Dixon began with the background to the NDA. It was established 12 months ago and is responsible for the UK's civil public sector nuclear legacy for the sites and facilities built from the 1940's onwards. It is currently running on a secure annual funding limit of 2 billion per year and predominately based and headquartered in West Cumbria with 4 regional offices covering its 20 sites across the UK.
12. The role and remit of the NDA is to ensure that the legacy is dealt with safely, securely and cost effectively in ways to protect the environment. That stands at the head of the strategy.
13. The NDA's role and remit is also to promote competition in the decommissioning and clean up market, maximising revenue from the commercial assets, to carry out Research and Development related to decommissioning, ensure maintenance and development of the decommissioning skills, promote best practice and secure value for money in the work that it effects and support the social and economic lives of communities around the sites.

14. Mr Dixon continued that the NDA in its first year had made real decommissioning progress at all its sites. Early cost savings have been achieved and the industry wide pension scheme is well on the road to being set up.
15. He reported that there has been good progress on skills, including the national and nuclear skills academy; a much better understanding of the liabilities and hence the change in the life cycle baseline cost. Stakeholder engagement has moved on and he used the WCSSG as an example of that and socio economic support is moving.
16. Moving on, Mr Dixon reported that the key principals in the first UK wide clean up strategy were safety, security and environmental performance, hazard reduction, acceleration where feasible, competition, skills development, socio economic support and stakeholder engagement. He continued that they are all still key priorities and that nothing had changed from the consultation period on those.
17. The consultation ran from 11th August to 11th November 2005 on the draft strategy and the environmental report. Over 40 presentations were made to SSG's and others, 275 responses were received, most of those are now on the NDA website. The NDA took account of comments received when revising the strategy and that was authorised for release on the 31st March 06.
18. Mr Dixon reported that central to the strategy is the competition policy and explained that it was key to encouraging innovation, delivering value for money and developing a vibrant supply chain. It also requires the creation of new site licence companies the first of which is currently happening at the Low Level Waste Repository.
19. The strategy also takes account of the BNG sale and is consistent with the NDA's aims of reducing the highest hazards.
20. With regards to the competition schedule, Mr Dixon explained that there is an awful lot of information in the strategy and he encouraged members and observers to view it on the NDA website. He suggested that specific issues could be discussed at future WCSSG meetings.
21. Moving on, Mr Dixon reported that 2006 is the start of the NDA's competition schedule; it is currently looking at the LLW repository at Drigg. In 2007 the BNG sale will be affected. In 2008 NDA will be looking to compete the Magnox South bundle as it is termed Berkeley, Bradwell, Hinkley Point A, Dungeness A and Sizewell.
22. In 2009, the Magnox North bundle to encompass Calder Hall, Chapelcross, Hunterston A, Trawsfynydd, Oldbury and Wylfa will be competed and in a separate package, Harwell and Winfrith.
23. In 2012/ 2013, Sellafield and possibly Windscale will be competed. The NDA need to undertake further work on that. Other dates needed to be decided for the remaining sites Capenhurst, Culham and Springfields.
24. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked Mr Dixon about the ongoing investigation by the European Commission on state aid for the NDA. He was surprised it wasn't mentioned in the NDA report because as he understood it, two days prior the European Commission actually found that everything was OK and it would not impact state aid, but for one exception, Mr Forwood quoted the press release – 'The NDA will continue to operate some

of the assets, and may, for some of them, not comply with the polluter-pays principal? Mr Forwood asked with regard to that:

25. If they do comply for some things on the polluter-pay principal how is the polluter paying if the NDA is financed by public money, isn't it the public who pay?
26. Where the press release states 'may not comply with some under the polluter-pay principal' who is going to pay in that case?
27. **Mark Dixon:** Mr Dixon was unable to provide a response at the meeting but agreed to source the answers and feed them back.
28. **Chairman** – The Chairman asked Mr Dixon to provide a written response for Martin and route it through the secretariat as soon as possible.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – BRITISH NUCLEAR GROUP REPORT

29. The Chairman invited Barry Snelson to present the report. Mr Snelson began by stating that BNG had presented its report within the constitutional time limits and wished to take the opportunity to fill out some of the details prior to answering any questions.
30. Mr Snelson reported that BNG had had a very good year on safety although it hadn't met its stretched goal of improvement BNG had out turned very greatly better than last year and had some exceptional performances on the site, for example the Plutonium contaminated material stores, 13 years without a time lost accident, the highly active evaporator storage team, 12 years, building 30, a million man hours, Building 29, 4 years without a lost time accident. Mr Snelson was delighted to say that there were some exceptional areas of excellence on the Sellafield site in terms of safety.
31. He went on to say that the majority of BNG injuries this years have been slips, trips, falls and strains of the upper back and shoulder and BNG is working on a campaign to try and prevent these. They generally don't result in serious injury, but BNG did have one employee who had to be hospitalised when they struck their head as they tripped entering a portacabin, but they were discharged the following day. Mr Snelson stressed that BNG intended to get down to zero accidents as it is the only target it can possibly defend morally. BNG has had a lot of encouragement from bodies such as ROSPA, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents; it has their gold award across all its sites, Sellafield, the LLW Repository, Capenhurst and Calder.
32. BNG has also been accredited with an ISO 19000 award this year for the whole of the Sellafield Site which Mr Snelson reported was a great achievement.
33. Moving on, Mr Snelson continued that it was the end of the first year operating within the NDA world as a tier 1 contractor and BNG has had a very positive experience, working well with the NDA. BNG set a company goal to help the NDA to settle and be successful and it has put its energy behind that. BNG has also had a lot of support from the NDA and it is going very well. It is a period of great change. Last week the Secretary of State gave the go ahead for the sale of British Nuclear Group and Mr Snelson thought that it would be a tremendous benefit for BNG employees and skill and capability on the site. He felt that a sale to the right buyer would provide job security and enhanced career opportunities.

34. The NDA strategy was also published at the same time and Mr Snelson noted with pleasure that at the point of sale that Sellafield will be given a contract until 2012 to manage and operate the site he was very pleased with that.
35. Mr Snelson continued that BNG still needs to focus on the day job and his role on the site is to ensure that all the employees concentrate on what needs to be done in safety and nuclear safety terms and in clean up and production operations against the backdrop of change and challenge. Mr Snelson felt that BNG is doing that very successfully.
36. Operationally it has had been a mixed year. Problems with Thorp that happened last April with the fatigue failure of a pipe in the feed clarification cell has kept the plant out of action this year and will for a couple more months yet.
37. Magnox is now running well with daily rates of 3 – 4 tonnes, which Mr Snelson thought was pretty good, BNG had an extended outage followed by a series of small failures in subsidiary plants but that suite of plants is running rhythmically and steadily now.
38. Reporting on Vitrification one of BNG's set of plants that are very important in terms of hazard reduction across the site, the stretched target was 525 and BNG achieved 503 a little bit short of the stretched target however the lines are operating well and Mr Snelson was sure they would do even better this year.
39. Up until the middle of the year BNG had problems continuing in the Sellafield Mox Plant, but towards the back end of the year and early this year it started to see some improvements in key areas like rod fabrication, grinding and inspection and powder feed and the lines are running well now. BNG has completed its eight assemblies, is building a ninth and there are good signs of acceleration being seen in the plant.
40. Mr Snelson reported that there had been excellent operation in the effluent plants. The medium active concentrates transfer was completed very successfully, BNG has exceeded targets in the medium active solvent areas and salt free evaporator concentrate areas. The building 241 emptying programme is going well, despite a little glitch after the first tank where BNG had a coupling failure but that was fixed on time and that target was reached by the end of the year.
41. Clearly BNG is moving to a 'clean up' mission and Mr Snelson reported that there has been a lot of progress on that which was mentioned in the report. The fuel from B30 was a notable action, it was the first time for many years fuel had moved out of B30 and BNG has opened up a nice route to B30, it is working on skip handling so it can start to reduce the hazard in that plant after many years, Mr Snelson was very pleased with that progress.
42. BNG has also been moving skips in B29 and another big project was the preparation of B38 with the arrival of a very large new crane which will enable installation of some material. That had gone without incident and was a very notable achievement in that plant.
43. Another significant success that Mr Snelson reported was the completion and capping of the tunnel on B41. BNG is doing a lot of work on recycling of waste, it has recycled 240,000 kg of steel which is categorised as free release, There are a couple of facilities on the site now which can shot blast, check and free release material so there is less material being sent to the LLW site and can be released freely.

44. Demolition of buildings in the separation area is progressing. Mr Snelson felt that BNG was starting to make the progress in clean up that it has been hoping for for some years, he reported that BNG had brought in some expertise from Fluor and from its own British Nuclear Group, America and that was working well.
45. In conclusion Mr Snelson reported that BNG is working now to finish the cleaning of the insides of the Calder Hall cooling towers of their packing and their water catchment devises and the project was proceeding very well. He commented that the community could expect to see the cooling towers disappear quite quickly, which would be a major skyline change during this year.
46. **Cllr Tony Johnson:** Cllr Johnson referred to page 6 of the BNG report entitled 'legacy ponds project', last sentence, and asked what had been awarded and to whom?
47. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson explained that as a recognition of the work that had been done in that project BNG gave away little carbon monoxide detectors to the staff by way of a memento or a thank you for the work they had done. Mr Snelson stressed that it was not particularly unusual where a work team had done something exceptional for BNG to hand out some sort of memento or token by way of recognition.
48. **Cllr Johnson:** Cllr Johnson felt a carbon monoxide detector was a strange token to give out, and thought perhaps a five pound note would have been more appropriate?
49. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson explained that the idea behind giving out a carbon monoxide detector was that it had a safety theme, like a smoke alarm has or a fire safety blanket, so the safety theme was the main thrust. He explained that there was nothing sinister about the gift at all, it was simply to recognise the safe delivery of a project over many thousands of hours worked without injury and a safety themed item was thought to be the appropriate thing to hand out.
50. **Cllr Johnson:** Cllr Johnson thanked Mr Snelson and re-iterated that he thought a certificate or a cheque would have been more appropriate.
51. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Barry for his report and added that he thought a carbon monoxide detector might be more useful than a five pound note, as it could actually save a life.
52. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson reminded members that there were three people who had lost their lives at Cleator Moor through carbon monoxide poisoning a few years ago, one of which had worked at BNG's Summergrove facility.
53. **Paul McKenna:** Mr McKenna asked Mr Snelson if he had a draft version of the NII report into the Thorp leak in his possession and if he knew when it would be in the public domain?
54. **Mr Snelson:** Mr Snelson did not have a draft report, and did not know whether the NII was going to produce a report, that would be a matter for the NII to answer. Mr Snelson confirmed that BNG had made its own enquiry into it and had published it on the BNG website.
55. **Paul McKenna:** Mr McKenna asked if there would be some clarification later in the proceedings about whether that report may or may not be issued.

56. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson confirmed that in his report he was going to cover the fact that NII had carried out an investigation into Thorp and produced a report. That report had been reviewed by senior management to determine if any further enforcement action was necessary. He thought that in the long term it would probably be the intention to publish findings from the report rather than the full report.
57. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked Mrs Snelson with regards to the 7th and 8th Mox assemblies mentioned in the BNG report, if he could confirm that it was from the target from this last financial year 2005/06?
58. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson explained that there were 4 done in 04/05 and 4 done in 05/06 and there are more to do in 06/07
59. **Martin Forward:** and what you are talking about now in 06/07 are part of the original target for last year?
60. **Barry Snelson:** BNG wanted to deliver 4 last year it's the 8th in that sequence so its an additional 4 to the 4 delivered last year, it's the 8th in total.
61. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked what the target is for Magnox reprocessing this coming year.
62. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson reported that it will be of the order of 1000 tonnes, but he would have to just check that it was a full year's production.
63. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked if it is the same figure that was originally in the near term work plan?
64. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson thought it would have been because the short fall in Magnox relates to the year that's just closed where BNG expected 700 and something and it got 280 and something. This year was always expected to be a full year as there are no planned outages for the financial year we have just entered now, so it will be 900 -1000 tonnes.
65. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood stated that Mr Snelson had mentioned the restart options for Thorp as being imminent, and asked what was meant by imminent, he asked if BNG was actually undertaking the repair now?
66. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson explained that BNG are doing little work in the cell, it does have designs available for equipment it could put into the cell at a later date if BNG so choose, or if other requirements obliged BNG to do so. Mr Snelson continued that BNG is certain that it can operate the system that it has now quite safely and within limits. The work that has been undertaken is out cell, such as permanent isolations of the tank for example, reconfiguration of the control system, new logic and new displays, changes to the weigh table. Mr Snelson thought the physical work had been done, BNG is working through tests and checks, but there is an awful lot it will have to do to convince themselves first and then the inspectorate that the plant can be brought back into service.
67. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked if BNG had been given official approval from the NII to actually implement this restart option?
68. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson confirmed that BNG has not had official approval off the NII to restart the plant; he also confirmed that BNG has not yet asked the NII to restart the plant.

BNG has its own internal processes to go through before it is ready to advise the inspectorate that it is confident and ask for their approval. Work is going on in the control systems, permanent isolations etc, and is well advanced.

69. ITEM 6 – UKAEA REPORT

70. Looking back at UKAEA's first year under contract to the NDA, Mr Mann reported that he believed it had been a successful year for the Windscale Site. Its safety performance has improved on previous years with just one lost time accident for a member of the team on the site. Mr Mann reported that UKAEA regret the injury, it was preventable. The injury had related to a slip in icy weather. Mr Mann reported that UKAEA has made changes to avoid a reoccurrence of that sort of accident in the future.
71. In terms of business performance UKAEA has achieved all of its environmental milestones for the year, it has achieved 58 of the 60 performance based incentives that were set in conjunction with the NDA and it has delivered 97% of the programme that was set out to achieve, Mr Mann was proud to report that achievement for the year.
72. Mr Mann turned to the elements of the report that had been distributed to members, wishing to draw attention to a few issues or developments since the time of writing the report.
73. With reference to the periodic safety review, Mr Mann pointed out that it was the culmination of a very long review by the UKAEA site team and included the site wide safety case, It is something that UKAEA has been in dialogue with the NII over some considerable period and Mr Mann thought it was a very useful piece of work in terms of justifying the safety cases right across the site.
74. Mr Mann reported that the assessment by the NII with regards to the piles safety case, in particular pile one is nearing a conclusion, A meeting was taking place at the time of Mr Mann's report which was addressing some of the conventional safety issues. Mr Mann was confident that the nuclear and radiological issues had been satisfactory resolved.
75. Mr Mann moved on to talk about the WAGR project, UKAEA agreed some months ago with the NDA and with BNG project services that the project should be funded as part of the Windscale programme to replace the funding arrangements that have been in place for a number of years whereby UKAEA had exchanged liabilities with Magnox Electric. On 1st April Mr Mann was pleased to say that a successful transition was achieved and that contracts and staff have transferred to UKAEA who is now directly managing all work on that project.
76. There was a similar situation in the leased operational facilities where again as of 1st April the NDA is funding UKAEA to carry out the engineering improvement works in that facility. Mr Mann had made reference to that on a number of occasions in the past, it is work related to achieving a modern standard safety case for what is a very important strategic facility on the UKAEA site.
77. In conjunction with NEXIA solutions the tenant and the facility an integrated safety improvement programme has been produced and has very recently been presented to the NDA. UKAEA will also be presenting it to a range of stakeholders in the near future.
78. Moving to report on redundant buildings Mr Mann had mentioned several that have been removed in recent months on the UKAEA site, Mr Mann pointed out that it represented (at

least in part) very cooperative working with British Nuclear Group to ensure that the two programmes on the adjacent sites align well and they are supportive of one another in what they do.

79. With regards to recruitment, Mr Mann reported that the team at Windscale continued to grow to match the need of the plan and more recruitment is currently underway. UKAEA has a small number of people on the site from its partner organisations CH2M Hill from America and AMEC from the UK partnerships that were signed earlier in the year. People are working with UKAEA now on the site with the intention of improving performance and help UKAEA to prepare for competition when it comes.
80. In conclusion Mr Mann said that he welcomed the statements in the NDA strategy in respect of Windscale and the intention to work very closely with UKAEA to sort out the appropriate future for the Windscale site and timescale for competition.
81. **ITEM 7 – NII REPORT**
82. The Chairman invited Peter Watson to present the report and informed the committee that Peter would no longer be representing the NII on the WCSSG. Mr Steve Lewis who would be taking over the role of Mr Watson had accompanied him to the meeting. The Chairman thanked Mr Watson for his commitment given to the committee over the last few years.
83. Mr Watson thanked the Chairman and said it had been a pleasure working with the WCSSG, LLC as it had been before and seeing the Chairman on a regular basis as part of the emergency exercises.
84. Mr Watson introduced Steve Lewis to the committee and explained that he was not new to the site he has worked on site before and knows the layout. He would become familiar with the workings of the WCSSG in time.
85. Mr Watson reminded members that the report that was circulated with the agenda covers the period up until the end of December 2005. He proposed to highlight a few points that had happened in the period since and explained that they would appear in the report being compiled presently which would be hopefully published at the end of April or early May.
86. At the request of the UK Government an International Atomic Energy Agency team had visited the HSE NII at Bootle and conducted an international regulatory review on the NII. The UK is the first major nuclear power plant state to host this type of mission under the IAEA modular approach.
87. The purpose of the mission was to conduct a review of how HSE intends to go about the appraisal of reactor designs in advance of specific proposals for a new build; to review the effectiveness of HSE and NSD and to exchange information and experience in the regulation nuclear safety in selected pre determined areas.
88. For this particular activity the areas were legislative and Governmental responsibilities, authority responsibilities and functions as a regulatory body, organisations of the regulatory body and the authorisation process and review and assessment.
89. The review team will publish a report and HSE will reply to that report. Further information following this activity will be on the HSE/NSD website in the near future.

90. Moving on Mr Watson mentioned consultations that NII is undertaking at the moment, one is a revision to NII's Safety Assessment Principles which are provided as guidance to NII's assessment inspectors on making decisions on the safety of nuclear activities and judgements about the acceptability of safety in specialist areas.
91. This is the third development of the Safety Assessment Principles. The first related to specific reactor assessment principles and chemical plant assessment principles and were available in the late 70's and early 80's.
92. The second generation was a joint Safety Assessments Principles document which was published in the early 90's. This latest version takes forward advances in thinking on assessment and also comments made by stakeholders within the nuclear industry and elsewhere.
93. The second consultation relates to HSE's work on the Energy Review.
94. Mr Watson was reminded and mentioned that as part of the IAEA team visit to the UK they also made a visit of Sellafield. In addition, Mr Geoffrey Podger HSE's Chief Executive and Mr Johnathan Rees, HSE's Deputy Chief Executive (policy) visited the Sellafield site in March and had a tour around new and old facilities, met with the Executive Team and Safety Representatives, and had discussions on quite a wide range of topics.
95. Mr Watson moved on to talk about the Thorp event, NII carried out an investigation into the event, a report has been prepared that is now with NII's legal team to determine the way forward. NII has been in contact with the site and are awaiting a response from them. Part of NII's due process is to consider the site's response and decide on the way forward.
96. Mr Watson reported that a level one emergency exercise was carried out towards the end of March which was a satisfactory demonstration of the exercise and a good performance of the fire fighting teams.
97. Although NII assessed it to be an adequate demonstration, there were a number of areas where some of the detail needed to be polished up by the site. NII will work with the site to identify those areas and look for an action plan to address the issues raised.
98. Moving on to discuss incidents on the site, Mr Watson reported that there has been a limited number in this period, one that Mr Watson mentioned was associated with the Advanced Gas-cooled Reactor fuels ponds. During testing of the high level alarm using a new approach there was seen to be an overflow of cooling water through an expansion joint in the pond, this caused NII and the EA some concerns and are investigating this as part of their normal interactions with the site.
99. With regards to the UKAEA Windscale site, NII reported last year an event in the Shielded Examination Facility. Recently a similar event occurred in the same facility but as there is currently a limited amount of operational activity, it was considered to be not as significant. NII has written to the site, and also to the operators of the facility, expressing its concerns of the things that were found as a result of its investigations and looking for improvements to ensure that both UKAEA and the operators address the concerns as part of the delivery of the actions against the Improvement Notices that were issued last year.
100. **David Humphreys:** Mr Humphrey's referred to the incident on the 4th December (in particular page 3 of the report, 4th paragraph down relevant to conducting a preliminary

investigation). Mr Humphreys thought the report put across the message that NII was not clear as to why the incident had happened. He asked if he was correct in assuming this.

101. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson explained that it was found to be a blockage within the system, although BNGSL is not sure how or where it occurred it is looking at the circumstances around the event. BNGSL is proposing engineering changes to ensure that a similar event, resulting in high radiation levels, can't reoccur. Mr Watson continued that it is one of those areas that is quite difficult to work on because of the material involved. To actually take the sample devices apart and to understand why the blockage occurred is quite difficult. The blockage was removed as a result of washing through the lines which resulted in the radiation levels falling, and which will also allow the engineering changes to take place.
102. **Barry Snelson:** The actual device is what we call a VOSL ie a Vacuum Operated Slug Lift that takes a small sample of the highly active material. The blockage didn't allow the highly active liquor to properly drain back and gave a shine into the working area. Everyone was evacuated as per the rules and the dose to individuals was minimal.
103. He continued that the amount of material was small because of the design of the device. ie the very narrowness of the tube that the sample is taken from, so there was no possibility of a large amount of material getting there, it was bound by the size of the pipe in the vacuum operated slug lifter, he stated that clearly it had implications and consequences and BNG is dealing with that.
104. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to page 11 of the NII report regarding the Intermediate Level Waste Storage strategy, he thought that what was implied was that Intermediate level waste arisings would be placed in the transport isles of store number 2 until such time as store number 3 is built and operated. He questioned this as surely the transport isles are in the stores to enable removal of materials in the event of an incident. He asked what would happen if the isles were overstocked and material could not be removed?
105. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson answered that the filling of that particular store has been a long running debate with BNGSL, the original intention was to fill the store completely including the transport aisles NII has now taken a line that this would not be appropriate. The NII now feel that the transport line should not be fully filled but it will give sufficient time to complete the build of EPS3 as an interim solution to the particular problem. The other option would be to stop the encapsulation of Intermediate Level Waste and NII thought that was a less satisfactory option. Mr Watson felt it was a balance of judgement.
106. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked if the public had to rely on NII judgement as to what is safe and what is not safe in terms of using the transport aisles.
107. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson agreed that was the case. NII is making an assessment about the implications of BNGSL wanting to fill the transport isles although it hasn't been agreed yet, Mr Watson felt that the balance of risk is in favour of part filling (not fully filling) the transport aisles. He continued that it should be noted that the packages that are stored are stainless steel containers that contain encapsulated waste, it is not raw waste, it is a monolithic concrete block, so the mobility of the material associated with the package is minimal, the actual integrity of them runs into many 10's of years if not longer. It is a judgement that NII is making.

108. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked that when NII has made its judgement, whether it is going to be put into the public domain, so that members of the public could see what had been decided?
109. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson said that the NII would inform BNGSL of its decision and it would be reported at the WCSSG meeting.
110. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood passed a comment relating to the problems he is encountering with regards to acquiring information from the NII in terms of the freedom of information act?
111. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson replied that the situation NII finds itself in with regards to this reference to FOI is associated with the advice that NII is being given in relation to the Thorp event and it is to this that Mr Forwood was referring to. He continued that the circumstances in relation to the EPS3 store are quite different.

ITEM 8 – REPORT FROM THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

112. Mr Mayall introduced himself as the Team Leader of the Environment Agency Sellafield team based at Penrith. The EA has a team of 6 people covering Sellafield, one covering Windscale and one covering the LLW Repository. The Environment Agency is responsible for the regulation of Environmental protection at those sites.
113. Mr Mayall proposed to take the report as being read and intended to highlight three of the areas from the report for member's interest. He also encouraged members to try and read the report as EA does encourage feedback on the reports.
114. The first area Mr Mayall highlighted was the Environment Agency's developing corporate strategy. The EA has recently published its corporate strategy entitled 'Creating a better place'. The strategy sets out how EA hope to achieve its vision, the vision being a better place for people and wildlife both now and in the future. Mr Mayall commented that it is a simple vision but hard to achieve, which was why the EA has set out its strategy to achieve the vision. The strategy is available via the EA website, or by contacting the Penrith office to request a copy.
115. Below the corporate strategy the EA is also developing more specific strategies for its regulation of radioactive substances within England and Wales which is a more specific and technical area. Within that it is also developing a regulatory strategy for its work at Sellafield. EA has begun some early work on that and has shared it with various key partners, such as the Company, the NDA and the NII and are taking early feedback to develop a second version very shortly. Mr Mayall would share the strategy with the WCSSG when in a position to do so.
116. Mr Mayall summarised what the strategy was trying to do. The EA recognise that Sellafield is a complex and unique site and is going through a great period of change and EA feel it is important to set out what its expectations are over the longer term.
117. The second area Mr Mayall highlighted was regarding radioactive discharges to sea and air. He explained that the sites have an authorisation under the radioactive substances act to dispose and discharge of radioactive waste. The EA has recently received the completed figures for disposals and discharges for 2005 and for Sellafield site, Mr Mayall reported that none of the discharges exceed 34% of the relevant site limit in the authorisation.

118. This was principally because of low reprocessing throughputs and because of various improvements to waste management at the site. There has been a general decrease in discharges in 2005 when compared to 2004, more details of which could be found in the EA's RIFE report which is the Radioactivity in food and Environment report which is published later in the year and will be presented to the Environmental Health sub committee.
119. The third area Mr Mayall highlighted was regarding the status of the various permits and authorisations which the sites have. The EA has very recently issued a minor variation to the Sellafield authorisation which documents and brings into force some minor changes to the authorisation which Sellafield possesses to dispose of radioactive wastes. The change that Mr Mayall highlighted was that EA has confirmed the reduction in the limit for Tc-99 in discharges to sea, the culmination of a long process involving the regulators and the operator and other parties in getting the discharges down.
120. Mr Mayall continued that there have also been some minor changes to the limits which apply to individual facilities at the Site; this is the lower tier of control at the site which applies to individual facilities. There have been some changes both up and down in the authorised limits.
121. A couple of new improvement conditions have also been introduced, one relating to carrying out maintenance and clean up work within the on site lagoon system which is in the centre of the site, to remove solids and prevent solids from entering the system.
122. Another new improvement condition introduced relates to looking at improved ways of controlling the release of volatile radionuclides from the waste vitrification plant and HALES, the Highly Active Liquor Evaporation storage facility.
123. In conclusion, Mr Mayall reported that in relation to permits and authorisations the new authorisation for Windscale came into force on the 1st January 06 following a review process and the new Low Level Waste Repository authorisation is about to be issued very shortly. The EA's decision document for that authorisation has been published and is available on the EA website.
124. **Martin Forwood:** Referring to page 5 of the EA report and the mention of 34% of site limits, Mr Forwood stated that it was well recognised that there has been a lower reprocessing throughput and that the site always operates well within limits. He asked if it would not be sensible if you want to drive down discharges even further to bring the actual site limits down. Mr Forwood felt that to operate with 34% suggests that the limit is pretty big and too generous?
125. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall explained that going back a few years the EA issued the current set of limits as a result of a long review process where the EA did reduce the majority of the site limits to bring them down much closer to the actual levels of discharge. During that process the EA did take into account the need to drive down discharges by using tighter limits, there is however also the need to allow some operational flexibility. To have limits which are set too closely to discharges can create a situation, where through normal operations and normal operational fluctuations, you could be faced with a breach of those limits. Mr Mayall continued that the general policy is to set limits as tightly as possible, but there is only so far you can go with that. Since the new limits were introduced EA has seen some reduction of actual discharges. Mr Mayall thought it was a point well made and certainly an area that EA will be looking to tighten up on in the future but he stressed it

would need to be a gradual process and would have to take into account operational needs and various other factors.

126. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to page 8 of the EA's report, regarding restarting Thorp. Mr Mayall had said that with regards to Thorp the EA had been involved with the NII in the review of the proposed strategy which has been submitted to BNGSL. Referring to the question he had asked earlier, BNGSL had said it hadn't applied to the NII. Mr Forwood was unsure of where the Thorp situation was at the moment and asked for an explanation?
127. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall explained that in order for the plant to restart there is the formal licensing process that has to be gone through and as part of that, under the terms of the EA's memorandum of understanding with the NII are working closely with them to give input in terms of the environmental aspects with regard to any restart proposal.
128. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson explained that BNGSL has proposed a strategy to the regulatory body but didn't think it had applied for any permissions.
129. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson supported that and continued to say that what was clear at the beginning was that it would be quite a complex series of steps to get from where BNGSL were to where it wanted to be. NII asked for BNGSL to prepare a strategy to identify a bounding case of what it wanted to do without being too specific and bound that on safety grounds and environmental grounds so NII and EA could have a view of the sorts of scope of work they would be expected to cover and the timescales.
130. He continued that BNGSL has now submitted the overarching strategy for where it wants to get from and to to the NII. Mr Watson thought that NII had issued an agreement to it, which was agreement to the scope of where BNGSL wants to get to. What BNGSL is going through now are modification proposals and applying against those individual steps. Mr Watson wasn't sure whether BNGSL had submitted any to NII.
131. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson commented that Thorp was a big area with lots of intermediate steps to go through. He thought BNGSL had not submitted any plant modification proposals to the NII.
132. **Martin Forwood:** Referring to page 16 of the EA's reported, under the events and incidents where it talked about a leakage from the AGR fuel storage facility. The EA had said that at the time of the incident the pond level had been raised in order to test the response of specific equipment. He asked what the specific equipment was and why the pond level had to be raised?
133. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall explained that the piece of equipment, as he understood it, was for measuring the level of the pond water, his understanding was that it was a level gauge of some sort, which, to carry out a full and reasonable test required the raising of the pond water level itself. EA is still looking into the details of the incident but the test led to a leakage through an expansion joint through a gap which was previously unknown, which was not normally subjected to that level of water. There were also some issues regarding the rate at which the pond level was then returned to normal.
134. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked if BNG could add anything to Mr Mayall's response.

135. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson confirmed what Mr Mayall had said in that it was to test the high level alarms, however he did not have detailed information at hand about the incident. He explained that it overflowed into the catchment through the expansion joint which was thought to be in good working order; however it exposed a breach in the expansion joint above the level that the plant normally operates at. It was a functional test of equipment.
136. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson added that the high level alarm is there to protect against water from overflowing and is normally set just above the normal liquid levels. A high level alarm is to alert the operator if for some reason the water level is increasing. BNGSL proposed a new way of doing this by actually raising the water level rather than just injecting a signal into it. NII support that sort of activity because it actually tests the float devices of the alarm itself. NII found that the alarm didn't actuate so BNGSL abandoned the test and the people who were carrying out the test had assumed that everything had been put back to normal. Unfortunately what appeared to have happened is the water flows into the pond were left on and these were greater than the water flowing out of the pond. The NII and EA team are going to carry out some further investigations as to why that particular activity should have resulted in an overflow of water.
137. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall emphasised that there was very little impact on the environment. The facility collected the leaked material as it was designed to do and the water was directed to the effluent treatment process as designed in the case of a pond overflow. The system worked as is should have, but obviously it is something that should not have happened and EA is investigating and taking it seriously.
138. **Chairman:** The Chairman referred to the questions asked about the Thorp situation and felt that there seemed to be some confusion as to the pre-start process. He asked if it was possible for someone to pull a report together explaining the forthcoming sequence of events (ie: the process) leading up to the re-start of Thorp so it could be circulated to members of the committee and Mr Forwood.
139. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson didn't see any reason why the proposed strategy could not be shared as it had been with the inspectorate and the Environment Agency.
140. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson warned that there were some sensitivities around information associated with the Thorp event, and asked if any information going out into the public domain could be agreed with the NII first?
141. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson agreed to this.
142. **Chairman:** The Chairman re-iterated that it was more the process to be used as the detail which is more between BNGSL and the regulators.
143. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson agreed and stated that it would be the NII process that would be applied to issue an agreement to go forward.
144. **Chairman:** The Chairman was quite happy for both parties to work together and produce a small report that could go to committee members and Mr Forwood.
145. **ITEM 9 – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CO-ORDINATING SUB COMMITTEE**
146. The Chairman asked Professor Steve Jones to present the report in the absence of the Chairman (Elaine Woodburn).

147. Professor Jones began by stating that the CECSC meets monthly and its purpose is to enable the wider community to have a direct voice in the planning and execution of the NDA's work on the West Cumbrian Sites.
148. In starting its work last year the committee felt that it would be ideal if the committee was able to identify issues that were of interest to or of concern to the community and to actively seek views on those issues in other words to go for a bottom up approach on the identification of issues.
149. As part of that, the committee came to the view and reported to the last WCSSG scrutiny meeting that as the first issue to be explored the committee would look at the future of the Sellafield site, which is the condition of the Sellafield site at the end of the NDA's work, as the first consultation. That work has now been going on and a consultation has been mounted through a combination of web based consultation and invitations sent out to a broad range of community groups to attend a workshop. The workshop was held on 25th January 06 at the Lakes College.
150. That work has been completed and a report which brings together the output from the workshop and the responses received through the web based consultation should soon be available on the WCSSG website.
151. Professor Jones continued that the process has been quite informative in bringing out some general community views on what they would like to see on the site now occupied at Sellafield at the end of the NDA's activities there.
152. Continuing Professor Jones explained that the NDA recently indicated that they also wish to reach a view on the end states for all of its sites during the early part of next year and as such has invited Site Stakeholder Groups to put forward their views as part of that decision making process. The NDA held a meeting in Manchester for SSG's or for representatives of SSG's part of which was to inform them of what the NDA expected from them and how they might go about achieving it.
153. Professor Jones felt that the committee has work to do on how it can best deliver on that. What the CECSC has done so far will be a useful input to that, but if the Site Stakeholder as a whole has to reach an informed view on the end state for the Sellafield site to submit to the NDA by early 2007, some fairly active engagement and some form of process will be needed to ensure that happens.
154. Since the last meeting the WCSSG had also responded to the NDA's consultation on the draft strategy. Concern was raised at the CECSC about the difficulty of doing that particularly on short notice. As a general issue there is a difficulty of arriving at a Site Stakeholder view on particular questions or issues, as the WCSSG is a body with very diverse interests and the committee recognises it has to be careful that it doesn't end up in a position where trying to arrive at a WCSSG view it doesn't become a major exercise in diplomacy.
155. Professor Jones continued that this matter had been considered at a Chairman's sub committee recently and the Chairman would report on it later in the proceedings. The CECSC now has an action to think about what sort of resources and processes might be required if that sort of combined view is to be achieved or if not what might be a more appropriate role for the SSG to discharge.

156. In conclusion Professor Jones reported that it is challenging times and returning to what he had said originally about having an aspiration to have a bottom up identification of issues on which community consultation would be appropriate; the committee has also recognised that there are an awful lot of issues arising nationally as well and so the bottom up approach is colliding with the top down view which is another matter that the committee needs to consider as to how it facilitates consultation not only with SSG but with the wider community beyond the SSG on all the issues that are now coming forward for consultation.

157. ITEM 10 – ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE

158. Professor Haywood presented this report and started by stating that the sub committee met on 24th November and received reports of measurements of Sellafield related radioactivity in the environment in 2004. The reports also estimate the extent to which Sellafield radioactivity adds to the natural radiation exposure of local people, particularly those from groups at highest risk of exposure.

159. The reports were presented by scientists from British Nuclear Group, the Environment Agency and the Food Standards Agency.

160. The Foods Standards Agency told the committee that in 2004 a small number of local high consumers of seafood received a dose of about 220 microsieverts as a consequence of current and previous discharges. This was marginally higher than reported for 2003 but about the same as in 1999 although lower values were reported in the intervening period. There has been some upward and downward movement of discharges over this period but the main cause of variation in the estimated dose has been the seafood intake by these consumers.

161. Professor Haywood continued that for many years, the former Albright and Wilson plant at Whitehaven released discharges containing natural radioactivity into the sea. The radioactivity is still there and continues to dominate the dose received by the seafood critical group. In 2004 it contributed nearly twice as much dose as the Sellafield discharges.

162. Taken together, these two sources of radiation exposure gave a dose of about 600 uSv to the seafood critical group. This group is the part of the public most exposed to Sellafield operations but the dose they received including the Albright and Wilson contribution, was significantly lower than the 1000uSv dose limit for members of the public.

163. There were other pathways for radiation exposure affecting other critical groups of members of the public and these were reported to the sub committee but the associated radiation doses were much lower.

164. In order to estimate critical group doses, a wide range of foods and environmental samples with a wide range of concentrations are analysed by BNG and the Agencies. Professor Jones of Westlakes Scientific Consulting reported on the extent of agreement between the monitoring results of the site operator and the Agencies. Agreement was generally good. where analysis did differ, the difference did not affect the estimates of doses to critical groups.

165. In conclusion Professor Haywood reported that discussion at the November meeting benefited greatly from questions from members of the public. The Committee was asked whether BNG could produce a report on the carbon dioxide balance of the whole nuclear cycle. This was outside the scope of EHSC and Professor Haywood relayed the question to the WCSSG meeting.

166. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson asked if it was for the whole of the nuclear cycle, mining, conversion, isotopic separation, etc.?
167. **Prof Haywood:** Professor Haywood was sure that was intended. He suggested it may also be outside of BNG's scope and proposed that another source could be suggested or a report where this had already been done would be helpful?
168. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson reported that there had been in existence until British Nuclear Fuels plc began to shrink in preparation for the eventual demise an energy unit group. He felt it might be that that team had access to those sorts of calculations. Mr Snelson agreed to take the action away to see if anything could be done, however, he did stress that the data may never have been collected by anybody and therefore may require a substantial project to try and devise it.
169. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood raised an administration point regarding the EHSC minutes from the November meeting. The minutes were still not available to the public and it had been almost 5 months since the meeting. He felt that 5 months was much too long to have to wait for them.
170. **Prof Haywood:** Professor Haywood apologised and explained that the secretariats workload has been increased by work on the preparation of the Near Term Work Plan which caused delays. He continued that the minutes would not in any case be confirmed until the next meeting. He only had at present unconfirmed minutes in draft and he had only had those for a few days. Working within the NHS it is quite difficult to find time to edit the minutes. Professor Haywood stated that the change in the sequence of meetings has caused a problem because the WCSSG meeting would normally have followed the Environmental Health sub committee Spring meeting in which case there would have been confirmed minutes. Professor Haywood said he would try to ensure a better turn around in future.
171. **Chairman:** The Chairman had noted that there was a problem with the turn around and said that the WCSSG secretariat would be working with the EHSC secretariat to see if more support could be offered to improve things.
172. **Chairman:** The Chairman mentioned that Tritium was found in the Drigg stream the rail stream and the Ian split which he could understand as they are all down stream, however it had also been found in Wastwater, he couldn't understand how tritium had got into Wastwater, he asked if it travelled airborne and how it finds its way to Wastwater.
173. **Prof Haywood:** Professor Haywood couldn't recall what level of tritium had been found in Wastwater. He reported that there are natural levels of tritium, it is formed at the top of the atmosphere and is drained out. He wasn't sure whether the levels found in Wastwater were consistent with that or not.
174. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall added for information that there is probably still a trace of tritium from weapons testing which would be a possible contribution to the natural levels that Professor Haywood had already mentioned.
175. **ITEM 11 – EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE**
176. Mr Cook reported that the 52nd meeting of the Emergency Planning sub committee was held on the 13th March, it was the first meeting that was held in public, the committee had also welcomed the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority to the meeting.

177. The committee agreed to postpone the election of Chairman and Vice Chairman due to only two elected members being present.
178. Reports had been received from BNGSL on five site exercises that had been held since the last report and were given details of forthcoming exercises as follows, 34th March 2006, a level 1 NII demonstration emergency exercise, 16th May 2006 a demonstration exercise for the Office of Civil Nuclear Security
179. The committee asked to be kept informed on how the issues arising from the separation of the Low Level Waste Repository from Sellafield would be addressed and to be informed of the actions to avoid a reoccurrence of the AEA Technology transport flask event and why stakeholders had not been informed about this matter earlier.
180. **Chairman:** The Chairman proposed to discuss the issue of the transport flask later in the proceedings.
181. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson asked if it would be possible to find a moment to discuss the sounding of the siren at a variety of events. It had been discussed at previous meetings some time ago, when it was the Local Liaison Committee. BNGSL is under some challenge from the NII to use the Site Emergency siren as a signal to the workforce to shelter in the event of an emergency that does not transcend the site boundary which is where BNGSL would normally sound the site siren. Mr Snelson said it would be a great benefit to the site to be able to do that, it would also mean that it wouldn't have to train the workforce or the neighbours with a new siren.
182. **Chairman:** The Chairman asked how soon he wanted the proposals looked at.
183. **Barry Snelson:** Given it appeared to be a straight forward matter, Mr Snelson was hoping that the committee would be able to approve it at the current meeting and asked if it had been through the Emergency Planning sub committee?
184. **David Cook:** Mr Cook confirmed that the issue had been discussed some 2 years ago. At that time the committee thought that the public sees the siren as a nuclear siren in the case of any drastic event that might happen and as such the committee thought it was a bit too much to ask that it could go off just for a plant emergency which could frighten the public into thinking that there was going to be a nuclear fall out around the area.
185. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson felt that if another siren sound was thought of, audible to all persons on the site which would encourage them to take cover it would certainly be audible to the sites neighbours as well, so it would be appropriate to use the existing siren because the community would certainly be concerned by an alarm even though it wasn't the continuous siren that it is now. Mr Snelson thought it seemed a much beneficial way of getting the site workforce to shelter even though there hadn't been an event off the site. It wouldn't be used in the event of a building emergency. It was just a method of getting the workforce on the site to shelter if there is some event that is outside a building, but not outside a site.
186. **David Cook:** Mr Cook said that the Emergency Planning sub committee had accepted that a new siren would be acceptable but was more concerned about using the old siren as it wouldn't be put across to the public well enough to understand that it would be used for other things. A new siren could be advertised and be accepted as a siren for something happening on the site and nothing to concern the public.

187. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson re-iterated that it would give another siren when there are already six alarms people have to learn. He personally couldn't see the issue about alarming people off the site they would certainly be alarmed by the lower level of alarm as they would be by a higher level of alarm and it gives less confusion for all parties and for the 44 persons who live within a 2 kilometre radius who are informed by telephone anyway on a shelter issue. He felt it would greatly assist BNGSL's emergency arrangements on site if people could be sheltered with one alarm and then use the telephone system that was already in place to advise the 44 people within the site sound radius about the siren.
188. **Linda McDevitte:** Mrs McDevitte felt that it didn't really matter what the siren was as long as the public knew that it was happening. She asked if they would know when an internal siren was being sounded?
189. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson proposed that BNG would be using the same siren except in a warbling instead of a continuous mode. The neighbours would hear it in any case.
190. **Linda McDevitte:** Mrs McDevitte asked if it would be advertised that the siren was going to be sounded?
191. **Barry Snelson:** Mr Snelson confirmed that BNGSL would inform its neighbours if allowed to that when the siren sounded it could be a site emergency or a Sellafield emergency. Sheltering instructions for them would be via the telephone system that was already in place and working well.
192. **David Humphreys:** Mr Humphreys suggested that it would be more appropriate to discuss the matter of the site siren at the Emergency Planning sub committee. He could give a number of reasons why he thought it was a good idea, but was concerned that he could spend a considerable amount of time doing so.
193. **David Cook:** Mr Cook agreed the best way forward would be to take it back to the next emergency planning sub committee where it would be discussed again.
194. **Chairman:** The Chairman reported that the Emergency Planning sub committee had had a long debate about the site siren two years ago and there were good ideas about why it should go ahead and quite a few people who had good reason to believe it was a bad idea mainly because of the content of the information provided to people, ie: if you hear the siren you take shelter, you turn on radio Cumbria and CFM etc. The Chairman thought in this day and age surely there should be a more sophisticated method of informing people rather than still using Second World War technology. He agreed the matter should be taken back to the Emergency Planning sub committee for further debate.
195. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson reported that since this topic was raised 2 years ago at the Emergency Planning sub committee NII has observed during the emergency exercises the people who were likely to be affected. There were significant numbers who would have been contaminated working in the plume down wind before the site alarm went off. Not only that but there were a number of buildings that would have been contaminated as a result of windows being opened so the numbers involved could run into the hundreds who would unnecessarily be exposed. NII's view now, after observing this, is that a decision sooner rather than later would be more appropriate. He didn't know when the next emergency planning sub committee meeting was but re-iterated there is now evidence to suggest that there is a real threat to people on the site until such time as the Sellafield emergency is sounded.

196. **Chairman:** The Chairman reminded members that the Chairman of the Emergency Planning sub committee (or any committee) can, at their discretion call a meeting at any time if it was felt there was a reason for that and if it was felt there was a definite risk. The Chairman proposed that the EPSC held a special meeting to look at the issue of the site siren earlier than the planned next meeting?

197. **David Cook:** Mr Cook was happy to accommodate the request.

198. ITEM 12 – WINDSCALE SUB COMMITTEE

199. Mr Ranald Stewart thought the written report accurately reflected the activities of the sub committee over the period since its inauguration, he pointed out that the sub committee is still in its infancy but it is progressing.

200. A site visit was held in November 2005 to give members a familiarisation tour of the site after which an active workshop had taken place. Mr Stewart reported that the open and frank exchange of views of the members at the workshop was very encouraging.

201. This continued with the sub committee meeting in March where there was a healthy and robust exchange of views enabling the committee to formulate a list of items as possible topics for discussion at future meetings.

202. Two of the topics highlighted at the workshop were included in the March meeting and were recorded within the written report.

203. A common theme amongst many of the discussions centred around safety and in particular the concerns on how that relates to competition and cost. Mr Stewart stated that the committee hoped that a member of the NDA commercial team could attend a future meeting to give a presentation on the NDA competition strategy.

204. In Conclusion Mr Stewart reported that it was disappointing that given the meeting was open to the public not many observers had been in attendance.

205. ITEM 13: LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY SUB COMMITTEE

206. The WCSSG Chairman presented the LLW in the absence of Cllr Sue Brown. The Chairman took the report as read, and proceeded to highlight that the transport issues through Drigg are topical to all the meetings and the committee is trying to move forward with it. The committee recognised that for people living near the LLW facility, the issue of the higher stacking decision had been a little bit of a shock, first the County turned it down then they approved it but moving on from that, the Chairman reported that one of the opportunities that came the committee's way was that stakeholders were asked to be involved in an optioneering process for vault 9. Vault 9 could solve the higher stacking problem when it is built and it is something that the committee wish to push forward.

207. Three options that had been run through a process already were given to the committee, and what the committee was able to do as stakeholders was look through the options the for's and against's and feed into the process which were the committees preferred options. The Chairman reported that he had been told that after the stakeholders views and comments went through this process the options had changed from option A to option B which was the committees preferred option.

208. The Chairman continued that stakeholders could actively make changes, there would be no guarantee which option will be used but the weighting that the committee had given has moved the option forward to the one they considered to be the best for the local communities and for the stakeholder group.
209. Concluding his report the Chairman stated that another issue that was looked at was community support, he reported that Drigg and Carleton Parish Council is undertaking a lot of work with BNG and that there was also the commitment from the NDA on the socio economic support. There is a lot of work ongoing that will try and support the community packages that will benefit both the village of Drigg and the surrounding communities.
- 210. ITEM 14 – REPORT FROM CALDER HALL SUB COMMITTEE**
211. Cllr Norman Clarkson presented the report and began by explaining that as it was the first meeting of the Calder Hall sub committee, the agenda had focused on agreeing the terms of reference for the committee as they define the objectives and purpose of the meeting as well as the roles of the Chairman and Secretary. The Chairman and Vice Chairman had also been elected.
212. Moving on Cllr Clarkson reported that the objectives of the committee is to provide a forum for representation of local communities interested and acts as the main interface between the local communities and the site operator BNG.
213. Accountability for decision making will remain with the NDA or the site licensee, the purpose of the committee is to provide an active two way channel of communication between the site operator and the local stakeholders, to provide the forum for the site licence company to consult with local stakeholders on site issues and to allow stakeholders to comment on and influence strategies and plans, also to report to the WCSSG meeting on Calder Hall specific issues.
214. The membership, apart from the WCSSG members who expressed an interest to serve on the Calder Hall sub committee are the Site Manager of Calder Hall, the NDA Site Manager, the NII inspector and the EA inspector.
215. The terms of reference for the committee were ratified at the meeting and are now available on the WCSSG website along with minutes of the meeting.
216. Cllr Norman Clarkson was elected as Chairman and Cllr Tony Johnson was appointed Vice Chairman.
217. Calder Hall sub committee will meet formally twice a year on the third Wednesday in the months of February and August and will feed back to the WCSSG committee after the meetings.
218. Mr Martin Grey, NDA gave a presentation, as did Mr Phil Campbell, Head of Assurance at Calder Hall and Mr Paul Brennan, Calder Hall Site Manager gave an overview presentation.
219. Concluding his report Cllr Clarkson reported that the members of the Calder Hall sub committee have been invited to attend a Calder Hall site familiarisation visit which is being held on Friday 21st April 06. Cllr Clarkson looked forward to the visit which he felt would give the sub committee a better insight into the issues facing the committee with regards to the decommissioning of Calder Hall.

220. ITEM 15: REPORT FROM WCSSG SUGGESTED T&S PROCESS & FEEDBACK FROM CHAIRMAN'S SUB COMMITTEE

221. The Chairman proposed to deal with the Chairman's sub committee feedback first. Several issues had been raised by both members of the public and members of the committee about the transition process that has been gone through and it was thought that the time was right given that the Committee has been in operation for 12 months for the Chairmen to review how the committee was operating.
222. One of the issues that the Chairmen felt was failing was correctly scrutinising more closely some of the work that is done not just by the contractors but by the NDA. It was felt that to achieve closer scrutiny, more work would be required within the sub committee groups.
223. The sub committees would scrutinise in more detail the issues for their particular sites. The sub committees themselves would also need to highlight issues that they wanted to scrutinise and would also scrutinise issues that fall out of the main WCSSG that are more relevant for the sub committees.
224. Another issue that had been raised was relevant to the Sellafield site. Previously the Sellafield site had been dealt with as part of the WCSSG main meeting as opposed to having its own sub committee. The Chairman believed that it was the right time given the issues surrounding the operational side of the site and the issues coming forward to have its own sub committee. The Chairman proposed that the committee would set up a 'Sellafield' sub committee to deal with the remainder of the Sellafield Site that isn't currently covered by the existing sub committees. The Chairman also proposed to Chair the Sellafield sub committee.
225. Invitations would be sent out to members of the committee asking for representatives to sit on the Sellafield sub committee. A number of people had shown an interest already in sitting on the committee.
226. Moving on, the Chairman reported that the two extra meetings the WCSSG has each year which entailed members going out into the community to try and sell the committee hadn't been particularly successful. The Chairman felt that more benefit would come out of these meetings if used to scrutinise the operators, the NDA and the regulators. The Chairman therefore proposed that the four meetings each year will still continue but they will all have a scrutiny element to them. They could be used to discuss issues that the committee has been asked to look at.
227. The Chairman reported that the Chairman's sub committee members also felt that it needs to be broadened because the WCSSG is also part of the National Stakeholder Group which is taking up a considerable amount of time of a lot of people. The National Stakeholder Group is usually held in Manchester or Edinburgh twice a year, The Chairman had already attended three. The National Stakeholder Group is also setting up sub groups which the Chairman felt the WCSSG should be involved in. In general the Chairman felt that more time would be needed at the other two meetings for feed back on national issues and where the NDA is seeking responses from the WCSSG on national issues. One that had began already was the 'Site End States' and the Chairman was sure there would be many more into the future.
228. The July and January meetings will give opportunity to scrutinise in depth the operators and the NDA in some detail. There are a lot of issues in the NDA strategy that people may wish to scrutinise.

229. Moving on to discuss the layout of meetings, the Chairman reported that the Chairmen felt that the layout as it stood was inappropriate and wondered whether it would be better to have a top table with core representatives (ie: Chairmen of the six sub committees, site operators, regulators and the NDA) with the remaining WCSSG members occupying seats in the audience.
230. The Chairman went on to say that the Community Engagement Coordinating sub committee has a very difficult job looking at consultations. The Committee has been looking at issues that it felt the community would wish to consult on, but the WCSSG is currently being driven by national consultation. The Chairman reported that the CECSC was now going to look at and prioritise the consultations that WCSSG could get involved in and which ones are not appropriate to respond to.
231. The CECSC is also looking at the process used to consult. In the past the website and workshops have been used. It may be appropriate for some of the sub committees to look at consultations on behalf of the main group. The CECSC would however, be responsible for pulling response documents together on behalf of the WCSSG.
232. Another issue that had been raised was input from the Ramsden Dock liaison committee in Barrow. The Chairman had made contact with representatives from Ramsden Dock liaison committee who had no difficulty in either attending the WCSSG meetings or providing information to the meetings.
233. The question had been asked about correspondence received by the WCSSG and whether a slot could be found for an update on correspondence received could be added to proceedings. The Chairman reported that for future meetings rather than have an agenda item of correspondence there will be a list within the agenda when circulated saying what correspondence has been received and the status of it.
234. The Chairman's sub committee members had also recognised that the Chairman's sub committee should consider the final options on the site end states, which the Chairman felt was a very difficult concept to come to. All twenty sites are working on their site end states. The Chairman reported that Sellafield isn't quite as clear cut a site as some of the others and there will be a lot of difficult issues. What the community may like as an end state may not be possible so he felt there would be many options to look at and that the end decision might have to go to the Chairman's sub committee.
235. Moving back to the issue of the movement of the flask which had been raised at the Emergency Planning sub committee, The Chairman reminded members that it was the flask that was transported in 2002 which went to the Windscale site. There were issues raised at the Emergency Planning sub committee with regard to the transportation of waste, not just waste that is travelling in the large flasks on the road and rail, most of which the committee knows has gone through a full process.
236. The Chairman continued that there are a lot of small movements of nuclear waste happening. The committee felt that given the issues surrounding the transportation of that flask there should have been some learning curves. The movement had happened some three years ago and the Chairman felt that it was right and proper for the WCSSG to scrutinise it.
237. There was also a request from the Council to look at it in some detail and thought the WCSSG would be the appropriate body. The Chairman proposed to set up a committee with one remit, to look at the transportation of nuclear waste. It will be quite a broad committee,

that will look not at what had happened in 2002, although that would be the starting point but at the lessons that have been learned from that, how we have moved on, and what advice is given to consigners etc. The Chairman stated that the sub committee would require advice from others with regard to safety aspects, there would be a role for the regulator to give some advice on some of the issues involved in this. The Chairman stated that the community needed to be sure that what had happened in 2002 can never happen again.

238. The Chairman explained that it had been a movement from a hospital; however most of the movements in this Country, wherever they set off from, nearly always end up in West Cumbria, so the Chairman felt it was up to the committee to take the lead on this. He stated that the committee had asked at the time of the transportation for some sort of enquiry. He didn't propose that the sub committee would meet too many times it was about ensuring there was a process in place and re-assuring the public.
239. Continuing, the Chairman stated that one of the other criticisms that had come from that was that the committee felt that as a scrutiny body, most of the members were not really aware of the issues that had happened until the case went to court and the local media picked it up and brought it to the committee's attention.
240. **Peter Mann:** Mr Mann agreed with everything the Chairman had said and was happy for the UKAEA to take part in a sub group to look into the issues surrounding the transportation of waste.
241. He was concerned however that the sentiment in the Emergency Planning sub group was that this body hadn't had the opportunity to comment on the event in question. Mr Mann wanted to understand why the opportunity was missed. He had looked back through the record, and the event had actually taken place more than four years ago now 12th March 2002. Mr Mann identified that the HSE included in their quarterly report reference to the event, Mr Mann had included it in his report to the WCSSG (then the SLLC) in June 2002 and had made reference to it in his presentation of the report.
242. Mr Mann acknowledged that it didn't trigger any response from members or the public at the time and he felt that is probably the concern that in some sense the reporting arrangements are drawing attention to things which have this sort of significance and are clearly of interest to members of the public.
243. In conclusion he re-iterated that he would be happy to work with the sub committee and others to try and ensure that learning is taken from the events and that as soon as awareness of such events is know people are made aware of them and what is being done to deal with them to prevent a reoccurrence.
244. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Mr Mann for his comments and felt it was only fair that Mr Mann should have an opportunity to put the record straight. The Chairman said it showed that very often members sit around the tables and obviously aren't taking in everything that is said to them because the majority of members do not pick up the significance of the issue that Mr Mann had rightly brought to members attention. The criticism that was raised was therefore more aimed at committee members than UKAEA in that the issue was picked up significantly later than it was reported to members.
245. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson added that when NII became aware of the event four years or so ago it was involved at the very early stages because the event was identified on a nuclear licensed site. When it became apparent that it started somewhere else and there were other

people involved, then the investigation into that event was passed over to other parts of HSE. Mr Watson felt there was learning for all parties in as much as NII being the HSE's representative on the WCSSG should consider how best to introduce these types of events for the Group's deliberations. Certainly, over the last three years Mr Watson was aware of this developing case being run by other parts of HSE. He hadn't appreciated that perhaps the committee ought to have been made aware of the impact of it.

246. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson stated that the Department for Transport, and their radioactive materials regulation department may have a role to play with regards to the issue, as radioactive material is transported in flasks and containers that are approved by the Department for Transport.
247. **Chairman:** The Chairman agreed that the relevant people needed to be sought to join the sub committee. On this occasion bad publicity was associated with the site when it was actually the site that found the problem and reported it. The problem started in Leeds and West Cumbria ended up with the bad publicity unfortunately.
248. **Secretariat:** The Secretariat suggested pulling together a proposed membership of the working group for the NII to review to ensure no-one was missed out of the process.
249. **Peter Watson:** Referring to the schedule for future meetings, another sub group and two further scrutiny groups had been proposed. Mr Watson stated that additional meetings which had occurred as a result of moving from SLLC to WCSSG had been identified at the time by NII as putting a lot of pressure on the NII's resources in trying to meet these additional demands.
250. Mr Watson thought the word used ie: 'require' regulators to contribute to the meeting was a little bit strong. NII would like to participate where possible which is how it has operated in the past. He re-iterated that the word 'require' was a bit strong in terms of getting the participation of the regulators.
251. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall agreed with Peter's point, the EA is only too willing to participate where possible but with a small team are finding it difficult to attend everything.
252. **Peter Watson:** Mr Watson thought one thing that would help would be a schedule for planned meetings, a meeting schedule had been sent the previous year but Mr Watson was unsure whether there was anything available to identify future meetings for 2006.
253. **Chairman:** The Chairman confirmed that there was a calendar of events which was posted on the WCSSG website, he had thought that all members had been sent a copy of the calendar (note from secretariat: - Calendar of events covering Jan – June 06 were sent to all members at beginning of 06 – 45,000 calendars had also been distributed to households within the community). The Chairman continued that he was not asking for attendance at every meeting what he was saying was that it would depend on the issues that the sub committees may be looking at. It may be more appropriate to look at the agenda first to see if there was a need for the regulators to make a contribution and if so, hopefully be able to attend. There is no jurisdiction all that could be done was to ask for attendance if there were any issues it would be beneficial for both the committees and the regulators to be involved in.
254. **Secretariat:** The Secretariat explained that with regards to the forward planner, it tries to ensure all the meetings happen at a set time going into the future that is on the website. Perhaps what would be useful if the secretariat and the Chairs of the various groups and sub

groups work together to identify the key agenda items sufficiently in advance to allow for invitation to the regulators and other parties to contribute and not just assume that they have to be there for every single one.

255. **Chairman:** Moving on, the Chairman explained that the T&S (claiming expenses) was a process that is being made available. Money was put into the near term work plan by the NDA to enable members to make claims. The Chairman said it had been rightly pointed out by the NII the level of commitment that people are making now, regular trips which are two day trips always midweek to Manchester and other places.
256. The Chairman reported that the T&S issue had been looked at very carefully, during which conversation had taken place with other colleagues that had on some of the other sites especially Dounreay already instigated a process last year. Currently no claims had been made for T&S but the Chairman now proposed an allowance for the role of Chairman and Vice Chairman. WCSSG members could claim travel expenses which had been agreed at 40p per mile.
257. Continuing, the Chairman stressed that unlike some people, a lot of people are paid by their agencies for where they go, a lot of councillors have to give their time up freely, therefore the Chairman proposed to come in line with Dounreay and others that the allowance for Chairman be £5,000 per year and the allowance for Vice Chairman will be £2,500 per year and all the other members will be able to claim out of pocket expenses. He asked if there were any comments members wished to make on the subject as he was aware that he was being put forward again as a nomination for Chairman and felt it should be addressed before the election. No comments were made and the allowance was approved.
258. **ITEM 16: VOTE FOR CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN**
259. There were two nominations, one nomination for Cllr David Moore as Chairman and one nomination for Cllr Elaine Woodburn for Vice Chairman. The committee endorsed the appointments of Chairman and Vice Chairman. As addressed in previous meetings, the role of Chairman and Vice Chairman would run for 2 years.
260. **ITEM 17: DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING**
261. The date for the next West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder group was announced as Thursday 6th July 06 which would be another scrutiny meeting although sub committees would not be required to report into it. The Chairman understood the timing for the meeting would be in the evening.
262. **Dr Paul McKenna:** Dr McKenna raised concerns about the layout of future meetings, the Chairman had mentioned the suggestion that present seating arrangements would be rearranged. Dr McKenna had some concerns about it and felt it was important that all members of the committee as it is presently constituted should have visibility; that included the councillors, union representatives and the Isle of Man government representatives.
263. He continued that it was not only important that business is carried out but it has to be seen to be done, he felt that if some of the membership lost that visibility it could be a diminution of their perceived role in the committee and although the committee has been presently only constituted for a year or so, it is very much seen as a continuation of the Sellafield Local Liaison Committee which goes back as far as the membership is concerned to the Windscale Inquiry in 1978. Dr McKenna asked the Chairman to take his comments on board.

264. **Chairman:** The Chairman confirmed there was nothing definite agreed it was something that he wanted to put to the committee and get an indication of their views.
265. **Carni McCarron-Holmes:** Cllr McCarron-Holmes supported Dr McKenna on what he had said. She felt that it was anti inclusive and went against the principals. She stated that members should not be sitting at the back, they were part of the committee and sub committees and she thought it needed looked at very very carefully as to how it would be seen outside with the public.
266. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Dr McKenna and Cllr McCarron-Holmes for their comments and agreed to look into it further.
267. **Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood welcomed the suggestions made about the sub committees and so on and recognised the difficulties in having too many committees. With regards to the Barrow liaison committee Mr Forwood asked the Chairman to ensure that DRS is also included in that as it is important and ties in with the transport committee that had been suggested. He commented that there had been an incident in Barrow Docks the previous Friday where a wagon had derailed, it hadn't been carrying any material but it could have been and it was this sort of thing that Mr Forwood felt the committee should be looking at.
268. **Chairman:** The Chairman stated that he was happy to take that on board
269. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked members for their attendance and wished them a safe journey home.