

**MINUTES OF THE QUARTERLY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT WHITEHAVEN CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 06 JULY 2006**

Committee members or representatives Present:

Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mr Ian Streatfield	-	Environment Agency
Mr S Lewis	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr M Dixon	-	NDA
Mr R Mrowicki	-	NDA
Mr Phil Bishop	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Mr B Snelson	-	British Nuclear Group Sellafield Limited
Mr D Moore	-	Chairman
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Copeland Borough Council
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 P Shawcross	-	Prospect
Prof S Jones	-	Westlakes Research Institute
Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Dr J Vickers	-	North Cumbria Primary Care Trust
Mr P Daley	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr R Stewart	-	Ponsonby Parish Council
Mr H Wormstrup	-	Whitehaven and District Trades Council
Mr Kevin McGilbray	-	Cumbria Constabulary
Mr Ron Hargreaves	-	St Johns Parish Council, Beckermat
Mr S Conney	-	Food Standards Agency
Mr D Davies	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr D A Ross	-	UKAEA
Mrs R Robinson	-	WCSSG Secretariat

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the 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.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – EXPLANATION OF PURPOSE OF MEETING

2. Having welcomed members, the Chairman reported that the meeting was an additional meeting to the usual 'scrutiny' meetings held in April and October. He had chosen the format in order to try to encourage more scrutiny into the additional meetings as well as giving members and observers the opportunity to speak with representatives from the site

operators, BNGSL and UKAEA and the site owner, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority by use of information stands.

3. He explained that the aim of the day was to concentrate on what had been delivered by the main WCSSG and sub committees. He explained that there were a number of exhibitions available for people to visit and encouraged members to do so.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – ACTIONS FROM THE WCSSG MEETING 06.04.06

4. The Chairman explained that it was important that actions should be addressed and gave a summary of those that had been raised at the previous meeting and their status. See attached appendix 1.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – REPORT ON THE EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE HELD TO DISCUSS THE SOUNDING OF THE SELLAFIELD SITE SIREN

5. The Chairman of the Emergency Planning sub committee has now resigned from the Parish Council and therefore from the EPSC. Cllr David Moore presented agenda item 3 in his role of Vice Chairman of the EPSC. He stated that hopefully a new Chairman would be appointed at the next Emergency Planning meeting.
6. The Chairman reported that the initial proposal of using the site siren to inform of incidents not transcending the site boundary was brought forward to the then Local Liaison Committee back in 2004. At that time the local community had concerns. The matter was raised again at the April 06 meeting mainly because the NII had sent a letter to the company saying it was uncomfortable with the current arrangements in place to warn people of an emergency.
7. Currently the siren is used to warn the workforce of a Sellafield emergency. Although it was never designed to warn the community it is quite clearly audible off site. Part of the emergency exercise plan instructs local communities to take shelter and listen to the radio upon hearing the siren.
8. The concerns that the EPSC had was that if the site siren was to be sounded at a lower level of incident, although warning the workforce it would still be audible off site and therefore the community at large would be effected.
9. The Chairman stated that quite clearly the EPSC never wanted to hinder anything that would protect the safety of the workforce on the site and he felt that the community and the industry worked well together with the industry happy to listen to what the community had to say. There were some interesting options put forward, some which weren't in the communities best interests. The EPSC's interests were the community and the safety of the site workforce.
10. The committee came to the conclusion that the siren could be sounded at a lower level of incident therefore giving the workforce early warning on the site. Acknowledging that the siren would still be audible off site, the committee had agreed that in the future there would be a free phone telephone available to the public, information of which will be distributed in leaflets to be produced. The phone will be available for members of the public upon hearing the siren to ring (more than one line), and would have a message on it telling people that it is just a test. The Chairman continued that when the site runs the tests at the moment the public are informed by advertising in the press the sounding of the siren. Not wanting to cause panic, people can also still listen to Radio Cumbria or CFM, which would ensure that

members of the public are reassured when the issue happening on site does not affect the general public.

11. The Chairman felt that a good compromise had been reached in giving the site what it requires to protect its workforce and it also puts something in place that the communities can have confidence in. Hopefully when up and running a test could be done before going live.
12. **Elaine Woodburn:** asked if the telephone warning system was just going to be a recorded message rather than a person to speak to on the other end of the phone. If people are concerned, she felt they would want more than an answering service, they would want some personal reassurance that there aren't any problems?
13. **David Moore:** replied that it would be an answering service, otherwise numerous lines would be required to be manned to answer all the queries from concerned callers.
14. **Norman McPhail:** confirmed that the system would be an automated system with a recorded message.
15. **Elaine Woodburn:** stated that hopefully it would never need to be used. She felt it would be worth trying it out first to see how people reacted to a recorded message and whether it would give them the reassurance they seek.
16. **David Moore:** responded that at present anyone who lives within 2km of the site perimeter is automatically informed by a telephone call. So the new system will be for residents outside the 2km radius. It could be developed as it goes along.
17. **Henry Wormstrup:** asked if the adverts would still be placed in the media?
18. **David Moore:** responded that it would be advertised fully. It would also be advertised in the new householder leaflets that go out to households up to 6km from the perimeter fence. He didn't believe that the siren was audible much past 6km, whichever direction the wind is blowing.
19. **David Humphreys:** I would like to point out one of the benefits of this new system, and that is that the site siren is sounded on site exercises (approx 4 times a year) and any member of the public who hears the siren during an exercise and perhaps haven't seen the newspaper adverts, can then ring the free phone number to be told that it is just an exercise.
20. **AGENDA ITEM 4 – REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CO-ORDINATING SUB COMMITTEE**
21. Cllr Woodburn reported that the sub committee evolved some two years ago with the main focus being to agree a process of how the community could get involved with consultations. This took quite a while to do and involved going out to Neighbourhood Forums and various other groups to raise awareness. A process was agreed which went out to consultation, this had received some really positive feedback. Two issues were identified by the community as areas of concern where consultation was required.
22. The first issue was 'site end points' and a workshop was held. This was received well by all who attended and the information will be fed into the full site end point consultation which will start soon. The second issue to be raised was AGR fuel, this was not immediately addressed due to the NDA announcing their intention to carry out an AGR consultation of its

own. It was felt by the group carrying out the same consultation duplication was inevitable. Because of this and other factors, the committee felt the time was right to review the role of the sub committee. There were many different issues that the committee needed to start responding to whilst ensuring transparency and the communities need to know what is happening and when it is happening. To address this the committee looked at what was happening and put them into four main groupings of consultation – National eg CoWRM, NDA strategic – site end points, contract specific, Calder Hall reactors, Ponds and silos and community requests - the committee wanted to ensure that there was a forum and a way for the community to raise issues to consider and decide whether the issue was of consequence to respond to.

23. With regards to national issues like CoRWM, the committee concluded that there are so many different people on the WCSSG that to try and get a consensus and a response to something on a national scale would be too difficult. Therefore the recommendation on national issues is that individuals and organisations make their responses directly.
24. There are the NDA strategic issues which are issues that the NDA has requested the WCSSG to look at. The ‘site end states’ is one that the NDA has raised recently and the work that the committee has already carried out on this issue, can be fed into that process. Then there are contract specific consultations like British Nuclear Group Legacy Ponds & Silos that the committee need to inform the community about.
25. The suggested process is that the WCSSG will still receive requests for consultations, from the community or the NDA or the site operators and a group will be needed to look at each request whilst checking that the same issue is not being consulted on elsewhere. The recommendation is that the Community Engagement Sub Committee will look at any such requests for consultation and decide whether there is the need to form a group and move things forward or not. There will be reasons why it may not be appropriate to consult on a particular issue at that moment in time, for example if something nationally is imminent or that the NDA will be requesting something, or perhaps the site contractors are going to come up with something at a later date. This is all to avoid duplication.
26. The group will review the content of the consultations to ensure the content is in a ‘simple English’ format, so that the average man in the street, who may know nothing about Nuclear can pick up a consultation document and find it interesting and feel that he wants to take part.
27. If the group feel that an issue warrants further consultation or that something specific requires consultation then the CECSC will commission workgroups which will consist of members of the WCSSG group, members of known organisations, local authorities or whoever the group feel is appropriate to contribute.
28. The CECSC has also decided to instigate some awareness raising events and has already identified a calendar of Joint Parish meetings, Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Forums etc. Cllr Woodburn asked members that if they knew of any groups that might welcome this awareness initiative to let her know. It is intended to commission leaflets, information on websites and pull-up exhibitions which can be displayed in libraries or on the mobile library. Awareness that the WCSSG actually exists as it is the main forum to get the public involved. The CECSC feel that a lot of people may be intimidated by the WCSSG or don’t know it exists, so they need awareness that there is a forum that they can come to. The committee is also looking at getting some handouts, balloons etc and to develop a strap line, e.g. ‘have

your say'; something that doesn't mention WCSSG, which pertains to nuclear and lets them know that they can influence their future by having their say.

29. With regards to the calendar of nuclear consultations, Cllr Woodburn explained that Rosina had sent an e-mail to every known organisation on the WCSSG asking them which consultations they intended holding, and asked the audience to let Rosina know of any future consultations so she could include them on the calendar.
30. The CECSC now has a new objective which is: 'To provide a route by which the community can access consultations relevant to the nuclear sites in West Cumbria'. This is a change in direction from physically going out and talking to people and trying to get them involved, to becoming more of an enabler, informing them of consultations and how to feed in their input. The website will be a major tool used, but first it will concentrate on awareness raising ideas.
31. Cllr Woodburn stated that the awareness raising would take a considerable amount of time and should not just be left to CECSC members. She hoped to be able to call upon members of the WCSSG to help. Each individual member of the WCSSG has a responsibility to go out and say that the WCSSG exists and how important it is.
32. She stated that the best way to explain what the WCSSG does is by word of mouth, and pleaded to members to continue to do that. She explained the committee needed to change with the times, which was the reason why the CECSC and how it worked had been reviewed.
33. She concluded by stating that consultations affect us as individuals and as organisations and if people really want to have an input, then they have got to speak up and encourage others to do the same.
34. **Henry Wormstrup:** Cllr Wormstrup disagreed with Cllr Woodburn's point relating to having people independent of the industry, he felt the committee needed to utilise the expertise available to it, along with community people who are directly involved with the industry as well as people involved in the community. He felt it needed a tri-partite partnership.
35. **Elaine Woodburn:** Cllr Woodburn hadn't intended to offend, she had meant that she felt there needed to be some flexibility depending on the audience being addressed. A lot of community groups would listen to a community representative rather than somebody from the industry itself. She agreed it had to be a partnership, the sub-committee had been started in partnership and would continue down that route. The main message she was trying to relay was that it can't be the sole responsibility of a small group of 10 or 12 people to get the message out to West Cumbria. It is the responsibility of every individual.
36. The Chairman thanked Elaine and commented that the work done by the Community Co-ordinating sub-committee of spreading the message, is work that all of the committee needed to take forward.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – UPDATE FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE

37. Professor Haywood explained that he wished to bring the committee up to date on one or two topics from the sub- committee's spring meeting which was held on 25th May. At the spring meeting the committee get the opportunity of a preliminary look at the site operator's

monitoring results for the previous year (only in outline). The detail that Professor Haywood had picked out was that the representative dose to the highest consumers of seafood was estimated as 2210 microsieverts in 2005, this was about 10% lower than in 2004.

38. Tim Parker had given the sub-committee a presentation on contaminated land. The NDA require a definitive assessment of contaminated land and it is anticipated that a contract for an enhanced ground water programme will be placed in September. Mr Parker had made the point that the implementation of the Sellafield monitoring objectives and principles on which we have previously been consulted, had released resources for this work.
39. A question had been received at the EHSC from a member of the public who had been present (Professor Haywood commented at this point that only two members of the public had been present), about the evidence of non-cancer diseases in atomic bomb survivors and how they might be relevant to radiation worker compensation schemes. Professor Haywood had agreed to look into it and was currently undertaking that piece of work.
40. He had also received a question relating to the times of meetings, and the sparse public attendance was discussed. The committee recognised that meetings during the working day were not likely to be attended by members of the public who are in full time employment. However, the cost in additional time and money of assembling professionals outside their working day is hard to justify whilst they outnumber the members of the public who attend. In order to try to resolve the issue, it was suggested that firstly the sub committee would tackle public communications and try to improve those. He felt it was difficult for a specialist group like the environmental health sub-committee, as its content would be interesting only to a particular group of people. The committee proposed that Professor Haywood would draft a press statement ahead of each meeting, for approval by the environmental health sub-committee members and for immediate release afterwards. In this way it hopes to raise the profile of its work, create a clearer message and make it worth reporting. He felt it would be very ambitious, but it would try it and see what response it got.
41. The Chairman thanked Professor Haywood for his report and acknowledged that he recognised the amount of work that the sub-committee does which is quite heavy-going at times. He stressed it was a very important role which it had undertaken for a great number of years. He welcomed the initiatives the committee was taking to try and attract members of the public.
42. Sue Brown of the Low Level Waste sub committee was scheduled to give a presentation however was unable to make the meeting; she would provide an update at the next meeting. The Chairman commented that there was lot of good work going on with the community of Drigg and working with the Low Level Waste facility as well as the other stakeholder groups, councils and Parish Councils.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT ON THE NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER GROUP ACTIVITIES

43. Richard Mrowicki stated that he was going to talk about the national stakeholder group and how that fits in with the activities of the WCSSG. By way of background, Mr Mrowicki explained that the national stakeholder group is a group of stakeholders that is set up under the NDA arrangements for engaging with stakeholders. That is a document that was developed prior to the NDA coming into existence and is published on the NDA website. All the site stakeholder groups and the national stakeholder groups are set up under those arrangements.

44. The national stakeholder group uniquely brings together representatives from each of the NDA sites in the UK and there are six representatives from the WCSSG. That reflects the fact that the NDA has four sites in West Cumbria, every other NDA site sends two representatives along to the national stakeholder group meeting. In addition to the SSG representatives, there are also representatives from national bodies i.e. Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, representatives from Government departments, regulators and there are people generally who represent national bodies who have national perspectives on nuclear issues.
45. It is quite a large meeting where approximately 100 or so people come together, including a significant number of representatives from the NDA. It is not a meeting that is chaired in the normal sense, it is facilitated by a facilitator who takes the members through the process. Mr Mrowicki intended to talk about the second meeting of the NSG which had taken place in Edinburgh, in April this year. The NSG meets twice a year, so the next meeting is in November.
46. The NSG is always a two day meeting so that people have the opportunity to get together and discuss the issues over coffee breaks, over lunch and overnight. Another factor is that people are travelling from all corners of the UK, from as far North as Dounreay in Scotland, from the South West and the South East of England. The NSG tries to meet at a reasonably central location, the first meeting was held in Manchester and the second was held in Edinburgh. The venues are chosen to allow people to travel to them relatively easily.
47. In the case of the second NSG, the group followed what is tending to become normal practice and that is to have a first day which deals with general updates. In April this year the NDA was just over a year old, so it was important that stakeholders understood exactly what had been achieved by the NDA. The first item on the agenda was opening remarks and an update by the Chief Executive of the NDA, Dr Ian Roxburgh. The strategy was obviously a very key component of NDA's work in the first year and Mr Mrowicki stated that the NDA was grateful to receive a large number of responses to its consultation on the draft. Terry Selby, the Strategy Director gave an overview of the strategy responses and what the NDA had done with the responses, and how they had affected the draft strategy in its movement from being a draft, to the final approved strategy.
48. During the first few months of the NDA's existence, it had a lot of dealings with Scottish stakeholders, as the Scottish stakeholders and Government have devolved responsibilities, which are separate to those responsibilities of the UK Government. So matters to do with waste particularly are devolved responsibilities for Scotland and have no relationship with what happens in England and Wales theoretically. Similarly, Scotland has its own environmental protection regulator, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency. So there are some parallels, but slightly different relationships between Scotland and England and Wales.
49. During the first twelve months of NDA operations, it held a number of discussions with the Scottish Executive and Scottish stakeholders, to agree with them how the relationship between them would be managed. The NDA reported back to the NSG that at the Scottish Forum, it had been agreed that Scotland, England and Wales would all come together at the national level, through the NSG. There would not be a separate national stakeholder group for Scotland as it was felt to be divisive. The NDA did however recognise that where Scottish stakeholders had particular interest, it would hold separate workshops to ensure that their views were properly taken into account.

50. At the first NSG, which had been held in October 2005, two issues groups were implemented, which were agreed with stakeholders to cover Nuclear Materials issues and Waste issues, (MIG and WIG). Updates from each of the sub-groups were given at the NSG. Mr Mrowicki also pointed out that a fourth meeting of the Waste Issues Group had been held in West Cumbria, today (6/7/06) and issues relevant to low level waste and intermediate level waste and how they affect the UK not just this part of the world, had been discussed.
51. Moving back to the NSG, Mr Mrowicki reported that a report was also given on the prioritisation process that the NDA is developing in conjunction with regulators and its contractors. This is an activity that involves the NDA, regulators, and stakeholders who have an interest in prioritising the work carried out on site.
52. That was a very complex explanation of what has been done and the conclusion of that was that the stakeholders invited NDA to produce a simple, easy to understand document that could be communicated and understood by members of the public without a degree of mathematics; which is the way it was portrayed at the event.
53. On day two the NSG focussed more on work and picking on three key themes which NSG1 had identified as being very important to stakeholders. The first one was the question of skills and how the process would be managed during the long decommissioning programme ahead. Secondly, how socio-economic issues would be dealt with, the NDA has a supplemental duty which relates to taking socio-economic factors into account as part of its strategy. Then finally a topic which was considered to be very important by stakeholders and that is how do the contracts operate and more so what impact was competition going to have.
54. There was a major concern amongst stakeholders that skilled workers will leave the industry, because it is perceived potentially, as an industry that is coming to an end. The sites are decommissioning, facilities are shutting down and perhaps workers who have operated in the industry, who have got careers ahead of them still, might be looking for alternative work and tending to move away. The NDA recognises that as a big issue. Mr Mrowicki commented that it was very interesting to hear stakeholders also putting it at the top of their agenda and wanting to know whether the NDA was going to take that into account in planning.
55. The suggestions coming forward from stakeholders who were involved in discussing these issues in small groups, following a presentation from the NDA were very strongly suggesting that the NDA should be looking to create a culture of skill flexibility. Basically to raise levels of skill in the industry, to help flexibility and to raise interest amongst the workers who obviously are carrying out this very important task. Stakeholders also advised that the NDA should be communicating more positively about the opportunities that nuclear decommissioning presents, Mr Mrowicki thought that would become potentially easier to talk positively about the nuclear industry, if there was a positive outcome to the energy review in the next few weeks.
56. There was a suggestion that the name 'Decommissioning' should be changed to something else and comments have included environmental clean up, remediation and restoring the environment. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority was set up with that name in Law and will remain so.
57. Moving to talk about the subject of socio-economics. This had generated a huge amount of interest, particularly amongst those SSGs who were present. There had been a lot of very useful input which will be fed into the NDA socio-economic framework, which will be a

document published for consultation later in the summer. The socio-economic manager had given an overview of what the socio-economic framework was all about, followed by round table discussions in smaller groups, from which Mr Mrowicki tried to distil some key points. Social cohesion was something that was recommended to take into account very strongly, looking at the overall impact of decommissioning activity on the economic wellbeing of communities around the NDA sites.

58. The NDA was advised not to forget about existing experience. The NDA's duty is not a prime duty, so it has to work with other organisations and other agencies who do have prime responsibilities for social and economic regeneration. It was advised and urged to ensure it draws on existing experience. It should be more pro-active in letting people know what it is doing socio-economically, i.e. what support had the NDA given and where in the country. Mr Mrowicki reported that the NDA has done quite a few things, but it was true to say that the NDA perhaps hasn't communicated effectively the areas where it's delivered specific socio-economic support. There are some obvious ones in West Cumbria, e.g. the community hospital contribution and the major skills project in terms of the University of Cumbria, the Nuclear Skills Academy which will be centred in this area.
59. The NDA has also looked at international experience but there is potentially as much to be gained from attending conferences in the UK, mixing with international operators. NDA should tap into sustainability development as a debate, it is looking to create sustainable communities post decommissioning and needs to be engaged with Government departments and other agencies that are working in this area.
60. The NDA was urged to implement its strategy as soon as possible recognising that the framework for socio-economic development is in draft at the moment. The NDA is setting up a socio-economic sub-committee of the NDA board, which will be independently chaired and will provide an audit trail for decision making by the NDA, as it allocates public money to socio-economic projects across the UK. It is putting in place the arrangements after its first year of relatively ad-hoc approaches to socio-economic support.
61. The SSGs are going to be key in all of this and the impact of SSGs in terms of public views on what the NDA should be doing, are going to be very important in working with local authorities and local communities, to understand what the key issues that the NDA need to be focussing on. Regional development agencies, in this case the North West Regional Development Agency is a key player. The NDA also need to make it absolutely clear what funding is available and how it will be used. The NDA in its budget of roughly £2.2 billion per year, doesn't have a specific line item which says socio-economic expenditure 'X million' or 'X hundred million', but what it has to do is create the savings through its programme to generate a budget, which can then be allocated to socio-economic work. All the monies that NDA has spent in the last twelve months came about as a result of savings achieved by its contractors on site; Mr Mrowicki stated that credit is due to them for their achievements.
62. Moving on to talk about contracts and competition, Mr Mrowicki stated that it is always an emotive subject. A major concern that has been echoed all over, is regarding stakeholder engagement in the process for contractor selection. People are familiar with NDA's present contractors, British Nuclear Group and UKAEA, they understand how they operate, they've experienced those contractors for many, many years. A change is naturally unsettling for people to comprehend. NDA had a lot of pleas for as much involvement as is possible in this legalistic contracting and commercial process. NDA is bound to operate in accordance with

the Official Journal of the European Union (OJEU), in terms of procurement regulations, and there are certain commercially sensitive things that will not be eligible for discussion; but wherever practical NDA will consult with people and will involve people as it goes through the process of selecting contractors to work on its sites.

63. NDA were inevitably warned about past experience, Railtrack, CEGB and British Energy, all of those organisations where perceptions are that safety standards were significantly affected as a result of contractorisation and competition. Mr Mrowicki acknowledged that the NDA needs to take on this experience and show that this has been done, when it issues new contracts.
64. The NDA also needs to explain clearly what the contracting process is, what the structures and arrangements are for liabilities and where the responsibilities lie with regards to the contracts. It has operated with contracts in place for the last twelve months and Mr Mrowicki felt it was important to keep on telling people the arrangements that exist now, and indeed will continue into the future. NDA are not changing things fundamentally, but it may be that it will end up with different companies operating some of its sites in the future, but mirroring existing arrangements.
65. Concluding his presentation, Mr Mrowicki reported that the NDA was told by stakeholders after NSG1 there were some areas of concern about engagement of the SSGs, so opportunities were provided at NSG2 for SSG representatives to get together before the main meeting; to network, share experience and look at best practice across their sites, as part of the process of building relationships across the UK. Generally the feedback was that it was a lot better than NSG1, particularly that SSGs had the opportunity to network and had lots of discussion. People were pleased that NDA had listened to their requests for topics for discussion but there are still tensions between local issues and national issues being effectively represented in one forum. Mr Mrowicki felt it was important that SSGs such as the WCSSG do understand that they play a part in the development of the national strategy, a very important part in the case of West Cumbria. The next NSG meeting is on the 7th & 8th November.
66. **Paul Shawcross:** was interested to hear Mr Mrowicki talk about skills and retaining skills within the industry and developing new skills. He felt that to keep those skills and attract new skills you need to retain good rates of pay and terms and conditions. He asked why the NDA was eroding terms and conditions currently on the site, through the roll out of the Industry Wide Pension Scheme? He stated that people were being denied the right to keep the same pension that they are currently enjoying and that new entrants coming into the establishment currently have.
67. **Richard Mrowicki:** was unsure that he could fully answer the question but thought it was an important point. His understanding was that the Industry Wide Pension Scheme (IWPS) was developed in full consultation with staff side and the Trades unions.
68. **Paul Shawcross:** agreed that was correct but stated that it did not mean that the unions agreed with it.
69. **Richard Mrowicki's:** understanding was that the terms and conditions of the IWPS were no less favourable than those of the superannuation schemes that it replaces. It was quite clearly a very detailed question and Mr Mrowicki was not in possession of the facts to support an answer.

70. **Paul Shawcross:** continued that at the moment everybody within British Nuclear Group has access to the combined pension scheme which is a final salary pension scheme underwritten by HRM Treasury. There are three big issues for the unions, those being the scope, the eligibility so that only the people in the site licence companies being allowed access. The tier 2 contractors, his Nexia colleagues, BIL workers and site management company personnel were all being denied access to that scheme. He went on to say that new entrants were not being allowed a final salary scheme and that that was one of the big incentives to get good people with good skills into the industry. He felt that they were being denied that and it was now going to be a final contributions scheme. He then stated that there was also the security of funding, because it was going to be trustee managed, there will be potential for a deficit to appear in the future and it's getting that security and the NDA to underwrite that security with funding.
71. **Richard Mrowicki:** stated that the NDA is a non-departmental public body and it had introduced the scheme with Government agreement. Mr Mrowicki pointed out that there were some really detailed points which he was not able to answer and didn't want to guess because they were such significant issues. He suggested that Mr Shawcross should direct them through the normal management chain. Mr Mrowicki said he would arrange if required for the NDA pensions manager to get involved in those discussions.
72. **Paul Shawcross:** concluded that if this is the IWPS, then the NDA has now changed to the combined nuclear pension plan, because the NDA does not want to cover the industry wide aspect, discharging its liabilities onto the site management company. He expressed his view that it was defamatory to members and is not adhering to the assurances given in the Energy Act and the letter from Patricia Hewitt. He went on to state 'Why should stakeholders then believe NDA will adhere to the assurance regarding safety? We need only look at the rail crash at Hatfield, 1- new owners, 2 - workforce's terms and conditions eroded, 3 - 'make-v-buy' implemented – and it resulted in the death of innocent people and we're at stage 3 today.'
73. **David Moore:** said the difficulty was that Richard Mrowicki did not work in that field, and asked Mr Shawcross to explain if it was a done deal now or whether it was still under negotiation?
74. **Paul Shawcross:** confirmed that it was still under negotiation, but time was running out. Prospect were holding a meeting next week with Alistair Darling on site, and would be making it very clear to him, how unhappy the workforce is. They also had a meeting with Jamie Reed and David Drew MP and would be asking for him to express his view. Prospect now has permission from its General Secretary to ballot for industrial action and speaking with his industrial colleagues Mr Shawcross stated that they had indicated that their members will be pushing for the same. Mr Shawcross wanted to ensure that all stakeholders who live in the community, understood the situation.
75. **David Moore:** thanked Mr Shawcross for raising the issue. He didn't think Mr Mrowicki was able to answer the questions as he had been invited with the remit of updating the committee on the National Stakeholder Group. He stressed the committee would do whatever it could to help facilitate in bringing this to an amicable agreement. He continued that the committee did not wish to see people in the area disenfranchised in any way whatsoever. He assured Mr Shawcross of the committees support.

76. **Elaine Woodburn:** stated that the production of a document on how the NDA is going to take on its socio-economic responsibilities would be helpful and would make things more transparent that it seemed to have been in the past. She stated that if the NDA was trying to transform the area it would need the buy in of the Regional Development Agency (RDA) and asked if he felt the NDA would be able to influence the RDA into recognising what was needed now, as well as what will be needed in the future?
77. **Richard Mrowicki:** responded that whatever is done in any area, has to be achieved through the agencies that have the prime responsibility for regeneration. The NDA does work and has very close contacts with the NWRDA in this part of the world and all of the large scale projects that have been supported, particularly the skills agenda and its development, has been done jointly, involving the NWRDA along with the universities and other educational establishments in the area. The NDA does have access (because it is an NDPB) to Government departments through the DTI and works through RDA's who really have to make sure that any proposals fit with the regional economic strategy; and are implemented as part of that as well. So NDA has to fit with Government and local Government structures.
78. **Elaine Woodburn:** So you can use your influence both nationally and locally or rather you will be?
79. **Richard Mrowicki:** We have been.
80. **Henry Wormstrup:** commented that he felt there was a need for a newsletter, a communication to the public on behalf of the NDA, of issues that are happening. He was aware of a meeting which has a three-monthly newsletter and thought they may be able to help with this. Secondly, referring to the board of directors of the NDA deciding to have a sub-group for socio-economics. He asked if there were any community representatives from Copeland on this sub-committee, and if not, why not?
81. **Richard Mrowicki:** replied that regarding communication, he agreed it was important to communicate with communities and stakeholders generally. NDA has a communication which is called 'Dialogue' which is a stakeholder newsletter published bi-monthly. It is specifically designed for members of the public, for stakeholders in the widest possible sense. Locally NDA is sponsoring an insert into the local newspapers through Cumbrian Newspapers and that's a publication called 'Futures' and that will go in the Whitehaven News as a supplement. NDA has commissioned this through Cumbrian Newspapers who has editorial rights to issue six issues a year. It deals with skills and the future as well as opportunities and updates in decommissioning, or in the nuclear industry. NDA contractors have been invited to submit articles to that publication, which is going to be a regular feature and it has actually resulted in the employment of additional people at Cumbrian Newspapers. So it's brought a couple of jobs to the area, just to deal with that particular insert.

With regards to the second question, Mr Mrowicki reported that the socio-economic sub-committee of the board will be independently chaired and it will comprise of two executive and two non-executive directors of the NDA board. There are no external representatives, so there are no local community representatives on the committee. NDA expect to take submissions and proposals from local communities to that committee via the normal committee process. He continued that if places were offered to Sellafield, then NDA would also have to offer places to Dounreay, Dungeness and Hinkley Point etc etc. It is a board sub-committee and will be considering submissions and proposals that have gone through

due process in the NDA that will ultimately have arisen from schemes and thoughts that communities and local borough councils have had.

82. **Henry Wormstrup:** asked if the sub committee has executive powers?
83. **Richard Mrowicki:** confirmed that the sub committee makes executive decisions in terms of allocation of funding.
84. **Henry Wormstrup:** asked for confirmation that the people who have no link to Sellafield whatsoever, can make economic decisions on our behalf?
85. **Richard Mrowicki:** replied that It is not making economic decisions, it is about deciding which projects put forward to the NDA, should be supported by the NDA. He commented that had the socio-economic sub-committee been in place at the time, the skills initiative would have gone forward to it and Mr Mrowicki could guarantee that it would have given approval to the proposal to fund the skills development and help with the funding of the University of Cumbria.
86. **Henry Wormstrup:** asked the Chairman to comment on a newsletter for this organisation?
87. **David Moore:** answered that it is something which can be looked at but pointed out that most of the information put out at the moment is put out via the website and the site publications cover the work that the SSG's do.
88. **David Moore:** asked Mr Mrowicki to clarify that the appointment of the Chair to the socio-economic sub-committee was an independent chairman?
89. **Richard Mrowicki:** Mr Mrowicki confirmed that yes, the Chairman was effectively a non-executive director of the NDA.
90. **David Moore:** stated that in which case he was not independent of the NDA.
91. **Richard Mrowicki:** replied No, he is a non-executive director, selected by the NDA.
92. **Henry Wormstrup:** 'So he's purely independent'?
93. **Richard Mrowicki:** answered that the non-executive directors are all selected by the NDA and he just happens to be one of them.
94. **Ron Hargreaves:** stated that with reference to contractorisation in conjunction with the discussion with the unions regarding dissatisfaction of the workforce. He thought it was a serious point that when people for whatever reason are feeling dissatisfied, and when we see a new culture likely to be introduced to the site; because parts of it are going to be contractorised; the two combined together can have a very significant effect on safety performance. He was sure the NDA was aware of that, but he thought the community would like some reassurance that this really is being taken as a very first priority. Over the years a dialogue has been built up between the present contractors, the communities and the workforce and it might have to be changed for all sorts of reasons, but it needs to be done very, very carefully.
95. **Mark Dixon:** assured the committee that before NDA start to develop the criteria by which it will judge the submissions that come in for a potential contract, that right at the very top and given the highest weighting would be safety.

96. **Ron Hargreaves:** asked how NDA would judge the safety performance in the UK of contractors who are presently working abroad?
97. **Mark Dixon:** stated that all you can do is draw parallels between the safety environments that they are in.
98. **Ron Hargreaves:** felt that would have to be a pretty good, tight process, because the people who are sitting around the site won't be all that impressed with a parallel, if the parallel isn't quite what you'd like it to be.
99. **Mark Dixon:** stressed that it is as important to the NDA to get that right as well, because its existence depends upon getting it right.
100. **Ron Hargreaves:** asked what sort of organisation the NDA had in terms of safety assessment, to be able to satisfy itself that the organisation that it is going to take on is capable?
101. **Mark Dixon:** said that the people who are sitting on the source evaluation are the ones who look at the submissions and are working to develop the criteria agreed within the NDA and outside of that. A number of those come from the safety community who are currently keeping us safe, so there is quite a bit of experience within those groups and specifically Sellafield.
102. **Paul Shawcross:** stated that what had to be remembered during the sale of BNG which will result in a five year contract being awarded to the successful new owner is that it is buying the site management company and the running of the site. What isn't for sale is the workforce and it is the workforce and quite rightly so, who are very unhappy at the moment. No new owner will be able to put that right because of being denied the chance, due to what the NDA is doing to the pension scheme and the 'make-v-buy' policy that they are imposing on that contractor.
103. **Henry Wormstrup:** commented that NDA has a responsibility by law for social impact, it is in the energy act, but NDA had not allocated any money. It is expected that the likes of Mr Barry Snelson and other such people, to make savings. If they don't make any savings, there isn't any money.
104. **Richard Mrowicki:** replied that what the NDA is doing is managing a portfolio of work not just relevant to West Cumbria, but throughout 20 sites across the UK. It is delivering that programme in a more effective way that had previously been achieved. At each and every one of NDA's sites, savings are being achieved, programmes are being delivered and accelerated, as safely and as securely as they ever have been; in many cases with improving standards of safety. NDA is confident that its contractors will achieve savings that NDA can then apply to socio-economic development.
105. That is what the NDA has been handed by the Energy Act and it has to manage that. It is determined to manage it whilst recognising the significant impact of decommissioning on the socio-economic wellbeing of every community, not just West Cumbria.
106. **Henry Wormstrup:** Does that mean that all the savings will go into the social impact pot?
107. **Richard Mrowicki:** answered that it didn't mean that, some of the savings are deployed to accelerate decommissioning programmes, but a proportion is fed into socio-economic

wellbeing. He reminded members that NDA had already put £3.1M into the site contract at Sellafield which is spent by BNG and UKAEA on NDA's behalf on socio-economic projects. So the £3.1M that existed under BNFL ownership now continues to be funded by the NDA, so that all of those things that used to happen still continue to happen. Nevertheless the NDA expect additional monies to be generated from savings.

108. **Observer:** You mentioned that you are charged with learning from your mistakes in the past, there was a practice run 10 years ago before the NDA, which was UKAEA & AEA Technology, that was very similar but on a smaller scale. Some buzz words that were used at the time, that were to do with people, were that people were the most important factor of the work within a company. We were told at the time that our new pension scheme would be no less favourable than the one we were in, and we were told not to make too much fuss, as nothing had been written in stone. We were let down on both points massively. Ten years down the line, I've got 9 years lost pension and have had to take out an extra pension. The NDA are going down exactly the same route again, you haven't learnt from the past?

109. **Richard Mrowicki:** was unable to comment, but accepted the statement.

110. **David Moore:** The Chairman concluded proceedings by pointing out that he hadn't thought that an update on the National Stakeholder Group would bring such a debate. He appreciated that the issue had been brought forward because as members of the community, the committee aren't aware of some of the issues that are going on. The committee had heard about the site wide pension scheme but weren't aware that it was causing so much concern. The Chairman stated that he certainly didn't want to see people disenfranchised in the community, so he was pleased that it was brought to the committee's attention. He wasn't sure that the committee had the powers to do a lot about it, but it could get involved and voice its concerns on the unions behalf given that it represents a large percentage of the stakeholder group in West Cumbria.

The Chairman brought the meeting to a close and asked people to submit their views on how they thought the meeting had gone. He announced that the next meeting would be held on 5th October, 2006 and would be held in Cleator Moor Civic Hall. It will be a full scrutiny meeting where there will be reports from all the sub-committees. The reports will be on the website at least 14 working days before they are circulated.