

**MINUTES OF THE 8th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT WHITEHAVEN CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 2nd APRIL 2009**

Present:

John Woolcock	-	Churches Forum
Mr Norman Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr R Hargreaves	-	Community Member
Prof Steve Jones	-	Westlakes Scientific
Mr Dave Weatherburn	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr Paul Shawcross	-	Prospect Union
Cllr S Brown	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr Mark Foy	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mr Andy Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Prof J Haywood	-	Environmental Health sub committee
Mr P Mann	-	Sellafield Ltd
Cllr Elaine Woodburn	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr David Moore	-	Chairman
Mr Bill Poulson	-	Sellafield Ltd
Dr Ian Hudson	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr Iain Irving	-	Sellafield Ltd
Cllr M Davidson	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr J A Clark	-	Prospect Union
Mr P Kane	-	GMB Union
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Mr Howard Rooms	-	Representing WCSSG Secretary
Mr David Humphreys	-	Senior Emergency Planning Officer
Mr Henry Wormstrup	-	Whitehaven & District Trades Council
Mr Mike McMullen	-	Studsvik UK
Dr Sohail Ashraf	-	Cumbria PCT
Mr Paul Dean	-	Cumbria Fire & Rescue
Mr David Humphreys	-	CCC Emergency Planning Unit
Mr Les Shepherd	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr Dick Raaz	-	Low Level Waste Repository
Cllr Peter Connolly	-	Copeland Borough Council
Insp J Roe	-	Civil Nuclear Constabulary
Mrs June Shield	-	Secretariat

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the eighth Scrutiny meeting of the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group, he pointed out that there were no planned fire drills and explained that should the alarm sound, the roll call area was in the car park.

2. He asked everyone to sign the register at the back of the room that was provided to account for everyone in the event of a role call. He asked that members sign the register that was circulating around the table.

AGENDA ITEM 1 – APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. The Chairman extended a warm welcome to Bill Poulson and Iain Irving, members of the new Sellafield executive team. From the NDA he welcomed Ian Hudson and Dave Weatherburn who is the LLWR facing representative. A number of members were unable to attend, some of which had sent along representatives, he welcomed the representatives to the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 02 OCTOBER 2008

4. The Chairman highlighted an amendment to the minutes from the DfT; these were included in the Chairman's report, already distributed. The Chairman asked if there were any amendments to the minutes of the meeting held on 02 October 08. There were none.

AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 7th MEETING

5. The Chairman asked for any matters arising.
6. **Henry Wormstrup:** Item 46 page 7 and my comments about Studsvik - the reports were received by the socio-economic sub committee and Studsvik are saying that they will only fund socio-economic issues in the borough of Allerdale and I commend them that one of the first things they funded, was Workington golf course.
7. **Note for the record:** following the meeting Mr McMullen wished to note for the record that Studsvik UK will be supporting organisations across West Cumbria and not specifically Allerdale.

Also, Mr Wormstrup referred to Workington golf course as one of the first things Studsvik had funded, Mr McMullen confirmed it is in fact Workington cricket club.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – REPORT FROM THE WCSSG CHAIRMAN

8. The Chairman reported that the WCSSG was implementing a new approach to improve the effectiveness of the WCSSG, which would enable the committee to gain greater uniformity from the programmes of work between the main group meetings and the sub committees. The aim is to achieve a more integrated approach to the work of the sub committees, so that they will do much more of the detailed scrutiny; and the main meeting will be more focused on progress on the issues arising from the sub committees. He continued that if that approach

hadn't been adopted the main committee would have had 17 agenda items to cover. .

9. He continued that the WCSSG secretariat is currently working on re-vamping the WCSSG website, one of the new features will be web alerts to members, so that they are informed whenever anything new is added to the website. The committee is also hoping to reduce the amount of reports which are printed off for each of the meetings, and once the website is launched, all the information will be uploaded onto the website promptly, hopefully making the website into a more useful tool for members as well as members of the public. Should there be any concerns from members about having to print off materials, the secretariat will be prepared to offer support, and hard copies will be available for those who do not have a computer.
10. The Chairman's report also covered the public meeting that was held in Whitehaven Civic Hall on 18th March, the WCSSG was asked to host the meeting as part of the site nomination process for new build. When the meeting was originally organised the emphasis was on one site which was the NDA owned land, but currently there are nominations for three sites in West Cumbria. The Chairman reported that the meetings had been well attended with over 300 people, which he felt showed significant commitment from the people of West Cumbria and a clear message was received that there was very strong support for new build, although there were opposing views and there were some concerns with regards to two of the sites that were being put forward. All the views have been passed on to DECC as part of the process.
11. In conclusion the Chairman reported that Nuclear Management Partners were now the Parent Body Organisation for Sellafield Ltd. He reported that the new management team seemed to have settled in well and he was pleased that they recognised the importance of continued good engagement, and hoped that going forward the relationship with them would be as good as the one the committee had with Barry Snelson and his team.

AGENDA ITEM 5 – REPORT FROM MR BILL POULSON, SELLAFIELD LTD

12. **Bill Poulson:** reported that it was his first time at the WCSSG meeting. He had been on site a little over two months, and was pleased to be part of the committee. He looked forward to working with everyone. Mr Poulson replaced Bob Pedde who had a family medical issue and had to return to the States. In his report he intended to talk about his personal drivers and his view of the way forward for Sellafield Ltd.
13. He updated the committee on an incident that had occurred the day prior to the meeting which had involved some disruption to the cooling water to the HALES complex. He reported that what had been learnt from the situation was that there was a very good response from the operating crews, site staff and the team on site. All the cooling water was restored, which maintained all the high active waste storage tanks well within design basis, by a significant margin, i.e. a factor of 8 to 1. He continued that it was recognised as an event that could occur, and that all the protective measures are built around that assumption. Obviously, it

was something that you would rather not occur, but there had been a very good site response to it. He continued that the site was in the process of an in depth assessment of why it had occurred and what could be learnt about that particular area for the future; and as importantly, whether there were any potential for similar occurrences around the site. It is referred to as “extent of condition”, where any event of that sort is analysed, not just for the event at hand, but more broadly, anything you can learn from it that could feature across the entire Sellafield site. He concluded that the assessment was underway and re-iterated that there had been a good reaction and response, but did acknowledge it was a serious event, one which he did not want to see happen and which had been taken extraordinarily seriously.

14. Mr Poulson reported that a new team came to the Sellafield site at the end of November and it had been an interesting 4/5 months. There had been a lot of initial initiatives tied to getting in place and getting things moving very quickly, but very thoughtfully. Mr Poulson stressed the thoughtfully part, and explained that the last thing you want to do to an organisation the size and the complexity of Sellafield is to introduce change, which will just come across as change for change sake. There is no value or benefit to such an approach, and it is disruptive. A lot of careful thought went into the planning of the first 100 days and the execution of that. Mr Poulson was proud to say that the 19 executives that had been proposed, are all in place. Those members of the executive will work with the site team, which has some extraordinarily good people in it, to go forward in executing the missions which are heavily related to risk reduction and clean-up; but also operations on the production side relative to vitrification, magnox and so forth.
15. Mr Poulson reported that a couple of themes were apparent from very early on, one being absolute emphasis on safety, which is absolute. The right number of events is zero. You always want to drive your trend lines down, and zero is the right number to achieve. Mr Poulson continued that the team had been out on site meeting and talking to employees, reinforcing safety concepts. There is an intense focus on safety and they want to maintain Sellafield’s good record and work to improve it and move it ahead.
16. The other aspect is to get a lot of attention placed on delivery and on the surety of delivery. Sellafield Ltd and the NDA are clearly in the spotlight with the WCSSG and external people – he posed the question: ‘can you count on what we say we are going to do, and when the day comes, it’s been done as we said?’. He reported that there was a lot of emphasis on getting schedule surety in place, working to get that commitment concept of “if it’s due on Friday, then Friday is the day it’s due”. He stated that the company approach it with what is called the 3P’s which is a feature that was coined early on, and means – people plus partnerships can yield outstanding performance; so the 3 P’s are People, Partnering and Performance.

People: Mr Poulson explained that the Sellafield site has a tremendous category of excellent people; that has become evident in the time he has been on the site. He has spoken to lots of people and been in their work places, and he got a sense of enthusiasm. He went on to say that he wanted Sellafield to be where people

come to see the best practice wherever they are from, whether it is in operations or in surety of delivery; that is the goal at the end of the day.

Partnership Mr Poulson compared this to ‘pulling the wagon in the same direction’. A lot of time in the first 100 day plan was devoted to that with all the regulators. They have had partnering sessions with each of the major regulatory bodies, 2/3/4 days each. He reported that it was clearly a major cornerstone of their relation with the NDA, and clearly a cornerstone of their relationship with people out and about. He confirmed that he had involved the unions in this, and included them in ‘Band 2’ meetings, which occur amongst the top senior staff once a month. He also reported that the site had stakeholder plans that have been developed in conjunction with the NDA, and have been signed off.

Partnership is really then with the people, driving to get performance and the performance is clearly in the area of high risk reduction. It is the cornerstone of things and the way it has been implemented on site is called PAIS – it stands for Partnering, Assess, Innovate and Sustain. It was brought in from the parent companies, Amec, Areva and URS. Experts in this business, from everything like project management to operational rigour can ‘scrub’ the site in conjunction with an equal number of experts from the site. So it wasn’t a group coming in from outside to scrub and assess everything, it was a partnership with the people already on the site; about 65 people from outside Sellafield and 65 people from within Sellafield. They teamed up in 14/15 functional areas to look at what is being done relative to what could be the best in class when applied.

The parent companies provided experts to share best in class approaches, what is already there which is also best in class approach; so it is not just a case of bringing everything in different. In some cases it is absolutely validating that what is already there is as good as it gets. The PAIS process of combining outsiders with in-house people has spent the last two months on site to develop the improvement initiatives that make best sense. The report is now being finalised, the effort to integrate all the recommendations is underway. The thing about it that was probably most illustrative, was how many initiatives raised had, at some time, been active on site in the past, but had just died away or had been overtaken by events. A lot of people asked us what all the new things that have never been considered here? The good news is how many of them were on site in past history, but didn’t get carried to the goal line. It’s a validation of sorts that the talent and the thoughtfulness are right there, as you would expect and hope.

Safety Mr Poulson reported that safety is the site’s top priority, and a lot of effort has been focussed on that and also looking at the root cause of events. There have been 6 INES events this past year, a couple just recently. Sometimes it’s due to some legacy things you find, you want to celebrate those because you obviously want people uncovering things, that you might otherwise stumble over at the wrong time; e.g. contamination from long ago or perhaps common mode failures in piping systems; those are the kind of things you want to dig out and put on the list to be fixed because they can bite you at a later moment. There are also areas where we need to stimulate people’s technical inquisitiveness in raising issues. We don’t want our people to sweep issues under the rug; everyone has got to question things and raise concerns. We’ve been spending a

lot of time driving that sort of cultural approach by people and rewarding people for having that kind of drive and interest in things.

Moving on Mr Poulson reported that in specific facility performance it had definitely been a tough year for SMP, especially with the world watching. He continued that the people in SMP are working hard to continue to make improvements in the production line. There have been a couple of good months lately, but it is a struggle and Mr Poulson commended the team for putting a lot of time and effort into it.

In terms of Thorp, shearing chemical operations are back up, the biggest challenge faced there is the reliability of equipment. There is a lot of complex equipment, from driers to big travelling cranes above the ponds, which present challenges because some are old, some are complex and some aren't necessarily still available in the catalogues; so they take a lot of challenging effort to maintain.

17. Magnox is behind target, it has gained ground from the recent restart, but it won't have done for the year what the site would have liked, but it is on a good path right now. Mr Poulson reported that in his office at work he has a chart that shows every facility on plant, with a colour code red, green or orange. The week of 21st March every plant was 'green', and this was the first time in a long time that this had happened. It was rewarding to see everything operational.

Reporting on the Vitrification plant, Mr Poulson reported that line 1 is running, line 3 has been down for a while with hydraulic challenges, and is due to return to service late spring; but cans were being poured at the time of the meeting.

Mr Poulson reported that decommissioning is really a centre piece because that is where the high risk reduction occurs. The high risk facilities are, and will continue to be the major focus with a lot of good project work underway. A lot more is going to be required for obvious reasons. This is where the high risks are on site, and it is where we want to focus integrated project teams, with the customer and with the regulator. A lot of the partnering talks were about those facilities and how resources can be best mobilised to make the most gain.

Mr Poulson went on to say that there is a lot of work required to build relationships with customers and with the regulators; and a lot of effort is focussed looking towards next year at the long term plan. Clearly that has got to be put in place, to enable the management of all projects to a baseline that has fixed, hard completion dates that can then be managed. He stated that at the next meeting he would like to go through this plan and he will report on progress against it, i.e.: where we were and where we are on the curve.

In conclusion, Mr Poulson stated that the site is striving to make Sellafield workers the workforce of choice for the world, relative to high hazard and complex jobs. If that is achieved, then it means they have succeeded in the objectives, and have people prepared for whatever might occur in the future.

18. **Martin Forwood:** I want to comment on the Sellafield Ltd presentation and in fact also go back tot the Chairman's presentation, I'm not quite sure that I

understand the integrated approach that you mentioned in this new style meeting, the case in point being that the Sellafield Ltd presentation is actually very short on operational information. You would probably say that it is now the business of the commercial sub committee, but for example you mentioned in your report the detail of the amendment of the Prohibition Notice, on the transport of Plutonium; my question to Sellafield Ltd – what is the exact status of that Prohibition Notice now and if Sellafield Ltd can't answer that and it has to go to the commercial sub committee, I would not expect the Chairman of that committee to be expected to answer that kind of question; so there seems to be a gap into which my kind of questions are going to fall.

Also with regards to SMP, you say that two assemblies have been made for the German customer, those two assemblies were probably made 8/9 months ago. Why it is taking so long to make the rest of them and I notice that in the Energize magazine, Sellafield Ltd was supposed to start making the next assemblies in March. Can you tell us how many assemblies have been made to date and how confident you are that the full eight assemblies for Germany will be ready for transport by September?

19. **Bill Poulson:** you are correct that there are two assemblies to date. Pellet production has been excellent, but assembly production remains to be done. The eight are still projected to be accomplished by September. The plant is in a shut down at the moment to make some modifications, consistent with the operating plan, but we still predict having eight by September, presuming all things continue on track.

We worked very closely with the regulators to resolve the Prohibition Notice, but I don't want to predict their comment back to us. We think things have been solved satisfactorily, but I don't want to put words into the regulators' mouth. The point is that we're dedicated to meeting those requirements for shipments.

20. **David Moore:** on the question of the work of the sub committees, what we're trying to say is that we will receive the reports from the sub committees, but that the detailed work and probably the best place where your questions should be asked is in the sub committees; that's where we'll get down to the finer detail that you're wanting to be involved in. The reports will still come to the main meeting and as you know all the meetings are in public so there's no restriction to where you can go to ask your questions. But I hope that as the sub committees ramp up to meet this scrutiny role that you'll find this useful and be able to have your input.
21. **Martin Forwood:** there's quite a time lapse between sub committee meetings, main group meetings, things happen, things move on as you well know; and it may well be that there are questions that are very current, that sub committees would not be expected to be able to answer.
22. **David Moore:** one of the things when the new website is launched, is that it will be interactive, so that any questions logged will receive an answer very promptly. Hopefully if there are issues, we'll be able to deal with them very quickly through the website. Most of the Chairmen of the sub committees are

contactable and if required a meeting can be called by a sub committee chairman at any time, if there was a major issue that needed to be dealt with.

23. **Martin Forwood:** I'm still not sure whether the transport Prohibition Notice is still in effect or not, I didn't understand the answer.
24. **Bill Poulson:** as far as I'm aware it's still in effect.
25. **Mike Davidson:** As chair of the commercial sub committee, if you ask me a question on our report which I cannot answer, then I would expect to refer that question to the person who said the words in the report. If they were not present, then I would get an answer in writing. I don't expect to answer for the people who have reported to my committee.
26. **Peter Connolly:** if sub committees are open to the public, where are they going to be held, because if they're held at Sellafield, that will limit the number of public who can attend these meetings. Can they be held in a public place where the people can attend them?
27. **David Moore:** I can assure you that all meetings programmed for the next 12 months are all in public venues. A calendar of events is also available for everybody and most members should have received one. You can be assured that there are no meetings held behind closed doors for this committee and public and press will always be invited to attend.
28. **Norman Clarkson:** just to add that the last meeting of the decommissioning sub committee, unfortunately the acoustics at the venue were bad, I'd therefore like to ask for some sort of equipment so that people can hear what is being said.
29. **David Moore:** I'll take those comments on board.

AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM MR DICK RAAZ, LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY

30. **Dick Raaz:** addressed the committee and commented that he had sent out a rather lengthy report to the committee, he intended to give a brief summary with the promise that in the future it would be a much more condensed report, focussing on the major activities of the site. This report was longer because the site had been involved in so many initiatives.

The first and most important difference since 31st March 2008 and 1st April 2008 was the addition of the scope to assist the NDA in developing a national strategy for the management of low level waste across the entire country and that had consumed an awful lot of work. In addition LLW had to continue the site mission of disposing of legacy low level waste from across not just the NDA estate, but the rest of the country also; and to do all of that safely.

A number of accomplishments had occurred during the year, a lot of effort had gone into the development of a very detailed life time plan which will serve as the baseline for the project. It is not a one year baseline; it is a very detailed 5

year, first instalment of the contract baseline, with the rest of the facility's life to be incorporated. In the process of doing that the life of the facility has been extended to 2070 with hopes of the implementation of the other waste management initiatives across the estate; Mr Raaz commented that they would hope to get much further into the century than that. If successful in doing that, Mr Raaz continued that it would represent a massive savings to the taxpayers because it will eliminate the need for a second repository anytime soon.

LLWR is working very hard with the NDA to develop the national strategy which would be issued probably this month for national consultation. Once approved, it will allow the implementation of a number of waste treatment management changes across the country, specifically to not dispose of very low level waste; only at LLWR, but into other facilities that could be created across the country. It would introduce the concept of waste treatments, which could dramatically reduce the volumes of waste needed, dramatically increase recycling of raw materials. Mr Raaz reported that he hoped that it would deliver all of the potential savings that he believed it would and the savings are to the order of £1B for the lifetime of the project.

Mr Raaz moved on to report that the container transport organisation has been created at the site to assist in meeting all of the waste consignors' needs as best as possible, as far up into the waste generation streams as possible, to maximise the efficiencies and maximise the reductions in waste generation and maximise the diversions to other streams other than disposal at LLWR.

LLWR has been working very hard to solve the 'short term' capacity gap. When preparing the bid for the project, LLWR was going to go out of business about right now, but it is in business; and will receive any waste that is consigned to it.

Mr Raaz reported that good progress had been made in construction of Vault 9, which was the size of a football pitch and very impressive.

The environmental safety case has consumed a lot of attention, the case is what the Environment Agency, LLWR management and the NDA customer will demand to show that the facility can operate safely into perpetuity without being a danger to future generations. Mr Raaz stressed that the company must succeed in showing the facility can be safe. It is a requirement of the Environment Agency to deliver that case in May 2011, LLWR would like to beat that date, but Mr Raaz assured the committee that beating it isn't as important as satisfying the demand for it to be a high quality, thoroughly researched, thoroughly underpinned analysis of the performance of the site, which requires the company know in great detail what is there. Mr Raaz commented that it had sparked some controversy recently in its efforts to fill out in greater detail the knowledge of the waste streams that came to the site. Data requirements in the 60's and 70's were considerably less robust than what is expected today, so the site is going back doing everything reasonably possible to ensure everything possible is known about the history of the site; both in terms of documentation and anything else.

Mr Raaz was very pleased to report the environmental safety case submittal last May, has been reviewed by the Environment Agency, with no major issues. It has provided good information to ensure that the work done over the next two

years, will deliver to the Environment Agency, to LLWR management and to customers reassurance that the facility will be safe going on into the next millennium.

Mr Raaz pointed out that there had been several less favourable times throughout the first year, not least was the recall advert about the sites attempts to gain more knowledge and detail about its history. Quite a lot is already known about it, certainly enough to assure everyone that the site is safe for workers and those around it. But the Company would like to maximise the potential for the site on into the rest of the century, and to do that more accurate information is needed, so that such great conservatisms don't have to be used in the calculations that must be provided to the Environment Agency for the safety case.

Mr Raaz reported that the preferred bidder for the Vault 9 construction project withdrew its bid 3 days before the deadline and that created a considerable effort on the part of the other remaining bidders, LLWR and the NDA in getting in place a viable bid. That had been achieved with a lot of effort on the part of everyone, but even given that successful contract being put in place with Birse Nuclear, the transportation plan that was associated with the bid was considerably different to the one that was in the original preferred bidder's bid; so County had to be approached for a new transportation plan, which was somewhat distressing to the Drigg community. The Company has worked through that and Mr Raaz reported that he felt it had done a pretty respectable job of meeting everybody's desires and expectations.

In conclusion, Mr Raaz reported that the move to solve the long term capacity gap is driven by the Environment Agency's authorisations to the various waste generators on what they can do with their waste. Currently the only disposal path authorised, is to LLWR. Many more expansive options are needed and the Environment Agency has been asked to put those authorisations in place. Mr Raaz thought that would have been done by the end of December, however the consultation process in this country was more extensive than was first thought and is currently ongoing, so the authorisations will not be available for at least two more months. Mr Raaz reported that he really wanted get those options available by the end of 2008 and currently they didn't have them, however it didn't mean that the site isn't striving and pushing to secure the right options for the UK.

31. **Paul Shawcross:** From your report with regards to improved management systems, you talk about the PAIS efforts resulted in savings in terms of monetary savings, efficiencies in personnel work time, fit for purpose business systems, IT improvements, minimised duplication and the removal of bureaucracy I assume. However it's got to be noted that your site did re-introduce overtime last year, and it would be fair to say that more people spend more time at work this year than they did last year. Is that the price you pay for those improvements?
32. **Dick Raaz:** No, the overtime arrangements that were in place last April 1st were ineffective, they didn't allow me to get access to overtime when I needed it, so we did away with the older systems and re-introduced a more traditional overtime scheme of time and a half and double time for various days. We're using very little overtime but I want it to be available, if the site is manned to be

able to handle 700 half height isofreights a year with existing staff and essentially no overtime. If the NDA decommissioning programmes can get to the peaks that are envisioned, that will produce more than 700 half height isofreights and I must be able to respond to that to keep the gates open. So I felt quite strongly that we needed to have a realistic, usable overtime scheme, so that's why the contract modification was put in.

33. Your question of are we doing more work? – Not really, we're worked hard for the time that we are working and I will emphasise that we are not idling about. We did a very thorough PAIS review of the skills that the site has and what are the skills the site needs to function the way we want; and we did find some gaps. We found an over reliance on sub-contract, agency supply workers; and we've been converting people to become employees of the licence company. We have increased that dramatically and we found some shortages in certain skills like project controls and project management and to certain extent engineering. We're just under-manned, the site was built out of a department at Sellafield with a very important difference; the department at Sellafield simply managed getting the waste disposed. As a stand alone licensed company today, we're required to provide all of the things that any other licensed company does, that the old LLWR as a department was getting from the parent at Sellafield – we don't have that, we're a stand alone licensed company, so we have to have all the engineering, management control systems, safety systems, all of this had to be built into LLWR and when we got there, I can assure it was pretty well done. With the little bit of experience the site had when we finally got in the seat as being stand alone, there were shortages; specifically in engineering and project management and we've been hiring to fill those gaps. We're trying very hard not to overwork and over stress the staff but I will assure you, we're working them hard and you're getting your money's worth.
34. **Joe Clark:** I'm basking in the warm glow of the taxpayer being saved £1B, however I attended a very detailed presentation given by LLWR and fundamentally their business case is based upon less volumes of certain waste being received from the decommissioning projects and operational areas. What that does is put that cost onto the projects, they will have to massively rework quantities of waste, to get down to the volumes that the LLWR has estimated. My question is to the NDA, I proposed at the last meeting that there wasn't any joined-up thinking on this, we may have a potential saving on one part, but it's a cost to another part. In reworking this waste to get down to the quantities, there may be new waste plants needed, individual waste plants for projects or one for serving a number of projects; so we're increasing the footprint again. I'm concerned that we're not getting true transparency of the costs because the NDA liability baseline is based upon estimated costs primarily from decommissioning facilities and quantities of waste; high level waste, intermediate level waste etc. The low level waste strategy fundamentally affects that, if we're going to add time and money onto the projects.
35. **Dave Weatherburn:** I hear what you're saying, but what we're trying to do with the team under the new contract is open up new waste routes and by opening new waste routes we're looking at cost effective alternatives. We're looking at incineration; we're looking at things like metal treatments. We're going to try

and maximise the use of the supply chain, where possible to provide the cost effective, value for money that Government demands.

36. **Dick Raaz:** When we are calculating the £1B, that is against the total liability so when we are suggesting other disposal mechanisms, the cost of those is included and the £1B is a net figure. Implementing some of the alternate waste streams, would require an investment, it's quantified, we know what it is; and we would like to shift the burden of the cost of that onto the supply chain, the contractors; as opposed to asking the taxpayers to build a new facility either at Sellafield or at LLWR. There are no plans to build anything at LLWR. We have in our plan a VLLW facility to go on the site; it's in out years because we must resolve the safety case question for the site's long term viability before we do anything. We're not going to recommend any waste stream path that ultimately costs more than business as it is done today. We do not want to save here, and cost there, without a benefit. The NDA watches this; the value for money equation is the centre piece of NDA's review of our proposals. We think we can do it and the NDA is hopeful we can do it, but we're not going to reduce costs at LLWR just to shift them somewhere else. We believe there are massive net savings.
37. **Henry Wormstrup:** Basically putting a metre cubed into LLWR as it is now, but by bringing in this new philosophy, it increases the life expectancy of LLWR and actually reduces costs overall.
38. **Dick Raaz:** The disposal of that cubic metre, if it's not going to come to LLWR, it will have cost something somewhere and we're comparing against all of those costs to make the determination, what is the right strategy; and that's what the national strategy work is all about. We are confident based on our experience in other countries that lower cost options are available and can be made to work; and will ultimately handle all of the waste. We're not changing the estimate numbers, but we are changing how they will be handled. Some of it will be treated, some of it will be ultimately disposed, some of it to LLWR and some of it to alternatives that don't really exist yet. But in the end the amount of waste will be roughly the current estimate and we hope to get better at estimating, we hope to bring to bear decommissioning techniques that generate less waste; and certainly move it to lower categories of waste. All of that produces efficiencies, but we're not going to do it if it costs more, unless there's some fantastic safety requirement. We've got to be safe, that is the enduring argument, it's got to be safe not just for the workers doing the work, but for the communities around them and for generations to follow, who will occupy this environment. So we're looking for the long range right answer and we're very confident business as usual isn't the most effective.

AGENDA ITEM 7 – REPORT FROM IAN HUDSON, NUCLEAR DECOMMISSIONING AUTHORITY

39. Dr Hudson addressed the committee and intended to pull out a couple of highlights from his report. He reported that the NDA had spent the last 6 months really focussing on the relationship and bedding in the new executive team; and working out how to ensure an effective working relationship with them. The NDA has been really pleased with the PAIS initiatives which Mr Poulson had outlined earlier. The fact that they were very inclusive of the people at the

Sellafield site; they included looking at good practice already in existence at site; and seeing if you could move that across the site in a more consistent fashion; also the focus on high hazard plants and some of the additional areas that the new SLC executive introduced were really good from the NDA's perspective.

40. Dr Hudson also praised the acceleration of the initial scope of work for the PAIS teams, which was intended to be carried out over a period of nine months, and it had been reduced to three. The other element of PAIS teams included aspects of validating some of the initial proposals in the bid, to see if they were actually valid; when you actually got in situ and seeing if things were exactly as they expected them before they joined Sellafield.

Other things that NDA had been really pleased about working with the new executive was the response to the focus on safety and the response to some of the incidents that had occurred over the last number of months. The new SLC executive has shown it could work very closely together, to deal with some of these incidents quite quickly. The culture of safety walk downs and visibility on plant, has also been excellent from an NDA perspective.

41. Dr Hudson reported that other areas NDA has been focussing on during the last six months, was the completion of departmental strategic objectives and also ensuring delivery in terms of finance and budgets for the end of the year, in line with what was planned from the start. Departmental strategic objectives talk around efficiencies and high hazard reduction. These are essential in terms of building confidence with people like the Treasury and Share Holder Exec, to ensure that we can actually demonstrate control and effective performance; for when we ask for additional budget to allow us to continue operations at site. Dr Hudson reported that the site had achieved pretty much all the departmental strategic objectives and the budgets have been finished off smoothly for the end of the financial year. He confirmed that had been an excellent effort on behalf of the site as it was at the start of the year, but also maintained through with the new SLC executive.
42. A lot of time had been spent preparing for the review of the life time plan and ensuring that the budgets were finalised for next year. NDA is in the process of issuing the annual site funding letter to the site. Dr Hudson commented that the NDA has managed to secure with treasury agreement for its end of year flexibility; so end of year flexibility allows NDA to take some of the additional monies generated this year through extended operations of electricity generation, and other aspects of the estate which generate income; and use that to pass on into the next year, in order that it can focus on high hazard plants. That allows the NDA to give the site the funding guidance in terms of the original CSR submission, but also allows NDA to increase the number on site in order that more progress is made on high hazard plant. Over the last number of years, when NDA arrived in 2005 the funding at Sellafield was around £0.9B, and it appeared that it was going to out-turn at £1.3B this year; and that increase could be attributed to increase in funding and focus on high hazard plants. Dr Hudson considered that was good news given the kind of circumstances that Treasury are finding themselves in at the moment; to persuade them to give that end of year flexibility is excellent from the site's perspective.

43. Dr Hudson reported that the NDA is updating the strategy and a commitment had been made to engage with the WCSSG on that strategy. NDA is going to have a Sellafield strategy going forwards, the intention is to bring drafts of what that strategy might look like, so that people can actually input as to what they would like in it. Also then as NDA develop the life time plan review, to update that strategy and regularly bring it back to the WCSSG, so that it can secure input to the approach. The intention would be that by the end of this financial year there would be a strategy that had been engaged with, worked through the WCSSG, reflects the view of the life time plan and gives some opportunity for objectives; so that people can actually see the progress and hold both the site and the NDA accountable for that progress.
44. NDA has the ongoing sale of land up for auction which has been extended by three weeks. Dr Hudson reported that the NDA is looking to gain the asset value associated with that land, in order to redirect that money on to clean-up and hazard reduction activities.
45. He reported that NDA continues to offer support and information to the work that's ongoing in West Cumbria looking at the land that is adjacent to Sellafield, so that they can put that site into the strategic siting assessment that the government is carrying out.
46. In conclusion Dr Hudson reported that the NDA was really pleased with progress made during the last six months working with the new SLC executive and Mr Poulson most recently. He believed that the competition yielded a number of benefits, and most of those benefits had been seen in reality over the last six months. It had been a good six months in terms of trying to ensure that the site drives forward for the future.
47. **Joe Clark:** I'd like to reiterate that Prospect fully support new build as part of a balanced energy mix, however what we are against is the unnecessary destruction of prime, soak away and agricultural land. Can I remind the assembly that the NDA was set up originally to accelerate decommissioning and to provide brown field land for other use. If as an example we accelerated the decommissioning of the Windscale Advanced Gas-Cooled Reactor (WAGR), we could create a brown field site that you could put two new reactors on. We see no need to destroy prime land that's going to be vital for this country's future. We think that the NDA's short termism of balancing the books, selling assets, is just consistent with previous government policies of selling off everything that we own. I really would like the NDA to look at the option of accelerating some decommissioning on the Sellafield footprint, with a view to putting new reactors on that brown field site.
48. **Ian Hudson:** I understand your comments in respect of new build and the use of land, it's interesting when you're trying to make funding decisions about what projects to actually accelerate and the things where you put your money. If you were thinking about accelerating the WAGR at Sellafield and clearing that space, how would you balance the funding against that versus say for instance, the old legacy ponds and silos? NDA has a very clear focus to try and make sure we put our funding in the higher hazard and the higher risk areas, in order to drive the hazard reduction. If you look at government policy, it's got a number of strands

to the siting assessment process. This is the first tranche of sites that will be put into the siting assessment and one of the key issues in terms of extracting value, is to actually get the sites early on in the first tranche of sites, because that provides the most opportunity in terms of getting the value associated with those sites. If you potentially wait 5 or 8 years specifically around WAGR, you potentially miss the opportunity and the value as well. There's always a balance in terms of where you spend the money, but it's also a balance on how you fit with government policy.

49. **Joe Clark:** Unfortunately, that's exactly the answer that I would expect, it's a silo mentality of government departments. We have a responsibility for future generations, and I think we would be remiss if we didn't try and change government strategy by influence. We really need to widen the remit of the NDA, they no longer can be agnostic about new build as they claim to be. It's part of a much bigger picture that we are responsible for.
50. **Mark Foy:** Would you like to comment on how much additional money is set aside for the 2009/2010 period to contribute to addressing the high hazard plants on the Sellafield site.
51. **Ian Hudson:** The outturn for this year is in the order of £1.37B, the original CSR submission for 2007 was £1.25B. At the moment the plan is being built on a basis of the scope which has been agreed with the site and with the regulators, and that could be potentially up to £1.4B. That doesn't mean that we have to have a blank cheque in terms of spending £1.4B, the emphasis has to be that we make sure we spend the money on high hazard plants. We also have to make sure that we focus some of the funding on building the effectiveness, in order to deliver some of those projects. Rather than say the answer is £1.4B, it will be what it needs to be in terms of funding on high hazard plants. Clearly we have a limit in terms of the excess that we generated this year, which we can carry over to next year, but what we're trying to do, is make sure we get the value out of that money so that it enables us to progress the projects that are important to us. Most importantly is the scope based upon what we've agreed to date.
52. **Elaine Woodburn:** If we lived in a perfect world that would be great, but I'm not quite sure West Cumbria can wait for government to change their policies. We're waiting for the results of that, before we even contemplate putting the Sellafield site up for nomination. With some of the adverse reactions that have been shown, not necessarily against nuclear new build, but against some of the sites that have come forward; the acceleration of bringing the land for sale at Sellafield forward, would allay some of those fears. Do we have a date and if we do, can we accelerate it, rather than wait?
53. **Ian Hudson:** We're not clear what the date potentially is for the site adjacent to Sellafield, We will try and find out, but it will be dependant very much on the original first three sites that we're focussing on. I appreciate your frustration, but to some extent, the NDA has recently been commended on the flexible approach that has been taken in relation to the land sales on the existing three sites. It's a reasonably novel and flexible approach which has been picked up as good practice. Traditionally some of these auctions can be a lot longer, this is a reasonably quick process.

54. **Elaine Woodburn:** I understand that, I would just like it to be quicker in West Cumbria.
55. **Norman Clarkson:** You are very fortunate in having a community in West Cumbria, particularly Copeland, who are more than not pro-nuclear. It's essential that we do get the siting right and if we can get it as near to Sellafield as it is at the moment, that would be far better.
56. **Joe Clark:** In terms of timing, I think there's a little bit of a red herring – the Windscale site could be down in 4/5 years, and we're talking much longer than that for the consultation and planning process. I don't understand why these things can't be run in parallel. With a commitment to clear a brown field site and a planning and consultation process going in to build on that brown field site, I don't see a problem.

AGENDA ITEM 8 – MIKE MCMULLEN, STUDSVIK UK

57. Mr McMullen addressed the committee and reported that the construction of the Metal Recycling facility at Lillyhall is still very much 'work in progress', the company is working hard towards the end of construction of the facility. It is still under the control of the principle contractor and there is no radioactive material allowed on site until after the commissioning process and the relevant licence instruments are received from the NII.
58. Mr McMullen stated that Studsvik was very proud that under the health and safety statistics, as a construction site it had managed over 50,000 hours without a lost time accident. While the site has been under the control of the principle contractor, Studsvik has worked closely with the principal contractor to highlight the standards required as the nuclear site licence holder.
59. Mr McMullen reported that a minor change since the report was issued, was in the final stages of installation, Studsvik have made contact with GenII and are working looking towards employing their first apprentice in September.
60. Studsvik now has a preferred contractor to provide the security to the site and those contract negotiations are currently ongoing.
61. To summarise, Mr McMullen reported that the site is still a construction site, but hoped to start active commissioning in June/July.
62. **Henry Wormstrup:** With regards to community engagement, it seems to be based on areas North of Distington, can the people of West Cumbria apply?
63. **Mike McMullen:** Yes there's nothing to stop them applying. At the moment it's because we are still in construction, that our community engagement is very localised. There are no limitations to areas and no geographical disposition between Allerdale and Copeland. Once we are operational, anyone is welcome to apply from any area.
64. **Paul Shawcross:** Our membership covers both Copeland and Allerdale, not only members of the unions, members of the workforce but stakeholders within those

communities; and I applaud Studsvik for the very easy to read report and what you actually are doing within the community.

AGENDA ITEM 9 – MARK FOY, NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS INSPECTORATE

65. **Mark Foy:** Mr Foy addressed the committee and explained that the latest HSE/NII report provided to WCSSG was for the quarter ending December 2008 and he intended to highlight some of the developments since then. Looking at transition, since the share transfer date of 24th November last year NII has continued to monitor the impact of the parent body transition, through all levels of the licensee's organisation. It is NII's belief that the initial phase of transition has had a positive effect on the site with regards to improved focus on safety and in addition, NII felt the workforce appeared to be reinvigorated, enthusiastic and supportive in wanting to deliver improvements on the site; that should further serve to enhance safety on the Sellafield site.
66. Over the last few months Sellafield Ltd has employed a range of expert teams on the site, the PAIS teams; that have been tasked with reviewing its organisational structure and the processes on the site with a goal of bringing good practice to the site in a wide range of areas and topics. NII has actively sought to engage with the PAIS teams to ensure that the regulatory concerns that NII had over the last few years are captured and given due consideration. This will mean that they're reflected in any recommendations and subsequent actions that would come out of the PAIS team review. That is with a view to seeking to apply regulatory leverage at the most appropriate point and hopefully to the best effect.
67. In terms of the transition Mr Foy reported that the NII is very conscious that the major impact is yet to be felt. The impact of the PAIS teams, the expert teams recommendations on the licensee's organisation is likely to be far reaching, and NII is planning to pay continued close attention to the developments on the site, to ensure that safety is given its due consideration.
68. Along with the Environment Agency, NII continue in regular dialogue with Sellafield and NDA on the issue of funding. The life time plan 2009 for the site has been recently received by NII who is currently reviewing the contents. Mr Foy explained that timescales for major projects have slipped, in some instances by significant periods, particularly so in the legacy ponds and silos area. NII's requirement, as a safety regulator, remains the ongoing safety on the site and Sellafield has committed to provide fundamental reviews of the high hazardous plants by May of this year. NII hope that will then consider the impact of the revised programmes, as set out in the new life time plan. NII is also pursuing the development of contingencies with the licensee in areas such as the legacy plants, where delays have been highlighted.
69. Mr Foy reported that in the last two quarterly reports to the WCSSG NII stated that it had written to Sellafield on the issue of the current ILW specifications which are in place, with the intention of trying to drive the retrieval and passivation of intermediate level waste on the site. That was to highlight NII's concerns on the protracted programme delays identified by the licensee for these particular projects. A response from the licensee is still expected in May 2009

and the information provided by the licensee in response to that letter, will be used to inform our regulatory decision making process. NII has already given due consideration to various enforcement actions it has at its disposal and will review these further, once the requested information from the licensee has been received.

70. Mr Foy continued that he had included in his report details of the shield door event that occurred within the waste vitrification plant, line 3, which had resulted in the inadvertent movement of the shield doors due to a hydraulic fault. Two points to note are that NII is still pursuing the apparent similarity with a couple of similar events that occurred in lines 1 and 2 in the 1990's; and why the associated learning was not applied on line 3, and that investigation is still ongoing. NII is also still awaiting the full justification for the shield doors, to allow the return to service of line 3.
71. Another event highlighted in the report was involving the inadvertent movement of a gantry refurbishment system on B30, one of the ponds on the site. As a result of NII's investigation, an improvement notice has been issued on Sellafield in relation to the requirements of licence condition 22; (modifications to existing plant). NII felt that the licensee had failed to make and implement adequate arrangements to control those modifications to that plant, which may affect safety. Sellafield is now working towards compliance with this improvement notice.
72. Some of the events that have occurred on the Sellafield site during the first part of 2009 include a small number of events that have involved minor leaks from pipes and ducts on the site that have led to instances of ground contamination. These have not resulted in releases off site but do demonstrate a lack of control by the licensee, and NII has asked Sellafield to undertake a review of these events with a view to establishing whether there are any common causes and issues, to ensure it is able to address them and prevent any further reoccurrences.
73. Mr Foy reported that NII has taken enforcement action as a result of the high level waste plant, plant maintenance schedule event. On 9th February NII issued a specification requiring Sellafield to furnish to the Executive on a regular basis, copies of documents and records that demonstrate that it is undertaking maintenance, testing, inspection and examination within high level plants; on plant that will affect safety.
74. NII expected Sellafield to be able to commence the implementation of integrated emergency arrangements via a single emergency plan for both the Windscale and Sellafield sites by 1st April. Unfortunately this has not been achieved because of the vagrancies of due process. NII expects this to be completed in a controlled manner during May 2009.
75. In conclusion and referring to the event mentioned by Mr Poulson earlier, Mr Foy commented that NII was notified of the disruption to cooling water supplies within the high level waste plants that had occurred on the afternoon prior to this meeting. The NII's site inspector was on site discussing with the plant the details of the incident and trying to establish exactly why the event occurred and why cooling water was lost.

76. **Paul Shawcross:** Talking about Calder Hall, you've commented in your report regarding corrosion etc, is that continuing problem going to change MOP8 and your view to getting fuel out of there quicker?
77. **Mark Foy:** I don't believe it will have a direct impact on MOP8 but discussions on the issues of corrosion and the impact are ongoing.
78. **Paul McKenna:** The 4th quarterly report which members have, on page 14, makes reference to project delays in legacy ponds & silos and mentions that a letter has been sent to Sellafield Ltd and one must consult the 3rd quarterly report to find out the contents of that letter. I downloaded the 3rd quarterly report from the WCSSG website and placed them side by side. It appears by comparison that there is a degree of inconsistency in regards to the degree of concern expressed with reference to the project delay. The 3rd quarterly report says that 'workstreams and hazard reduction projects are in a number of areas, subject to delay well beyond required compliance dates. NII has written to Sellafield pointing out that failure to meet the requirements of the specifications is an offence under law'. In order for anyone to gain access to the intent of that phrase, one has to read the 3rd quarterly report. Why does there appear to be a degree of concern expressed, which is different in each of the quarterly reports?
79. **Mark Foy:** The 3rd quarterly report was written straight after the letter had been issued and it was written in that particular way to give the WCSSG an idea of the content of the letter and how strongly it had actually been written. In the subsequent report, I didn't feel it was necessary to go into that amount of detail about the offence under law etc. It's just a summary to say there have been programme delays, we are still waiting responses from the licensee; but the fact remains that if there is a non-compliance with the specifications by the required date it will be an offence under law and we'll have to consider then what process we go into in terms of enforcement action.
80. **Paul McKenna:** so as a stand alone document the 4th quarterly report you would agree doesn't give any flavour of that at all?
81. **Mark Foy:** it would just repeat what went in the 3rd quarterly report. If it's the WCSSG's desire for me to continue to repeat what was in that, until the situation changes, then I'm happy to do that; but I would suggest that just presenting a summary of the current situation with the detail of when the letter went out, would probably give the best picture.
82. **Paul McKenna:** So the paperwork circulated doesn't give the whole story, we have to read all of the reports on the website to get the whole story of what's going on? The 4th quarterly basically says we've nothing much to worry about, but when you read the 3rd quarterly report, indeed there could be quite a lot to worry about.
83. **Mark Foy:** It does highlight that we've written to them and there are non-compliance issues with the specifications. The fact that the pack that is circulated to WCSSG members doesn't contain both quarterly reports, is a decision for the WCSSG, not for the HSE or NII. If it's the WCSSG's desire to have both the reports in the pack, then I'm quite happy for that to happen.

84. **Paul McKenna:** I'm aware that the Chairman has given some thought to improvements to the website and web alerts and maybe that will address it to some extent, but I'd like to reiterate the fact that the stand alone report doesn't give the whole story and there are several other inconsistencies in the 4th quarterly report, which aren't amplified to the same extent as they are in the 3rd quarter.
85. **David Moore:** When the new website is up and running it is hoped that all members will receive web alerts to inform them that information has been added to the site. I accept that the packs circulated contained the 4th quarterly report, the 3rd quarter report was put on the website because there was no scrutiny meeting during that period. I do apologise that you couldn't follow that through because the packs didn't contain both reports. Hopefully as we move forward, we'll address that issue, with them all being available on the website and you being informed when they're put there.
86. **Martin Forwood:** You mentioned the vitrification shield door events and your investigations, can you give us any idea when the NII is going to come up with a conclusion as to what action it should take as a result of that event; bearing in mind you have mentioned the two other incidents in 1991 and 1998. I can remember the 1991 court case on that incident where BNFL pleaded great leniency from the court on the basis that they were already suffering financially, because of the shutdown of the plant. They promised faithfully it wouldn't happen again, it happened again in 1998 and again just recently. Maybe not exactly the same circumstances, but what view does the NII take on how they should instil some kind of penance on the operators of that plant.
87. **Mark Foy:** We're very conscious that this is a repeat event with real similarities to what has gone before, the seriousness of that event is not lost upon us, but I don't want to commit to say that our investigation will be completed next month and we will be issuing a report etc; I don't think it's fair to do that. We have got a site inspector investigating the event, there's lots of paperwork to be trawled through in terms of who did what, when in the 1990's and to find that audit trail is actually quite difficult. So the investigation is still ongoing and I wouldn't like to commit to a date at the moment.
88. **Martin Forwood:** With reference to table 3 reference no 718 of your report, what is the alternative residue store for SMP, I didn't know such a thing existed. What is it and why is it necessary to increase the permissible number of residue cans in that store from 8 to 30.
89. **Mark Foy:** I'll take that away and get the information to you.

AGENDA ITEM 10 – ANDY MAYALL, ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

90. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall addressed the committee and reported that the EA was involved with the NII and other regulators in monitoring and assessing the recent transition of the parent body at Sellafield, which was a two year project to oversee and to provide regulatory advice. Mr Mayall reported that the transition

went smoothly and was well managed by the SLC. Further improvements and changes to be brought about by the SLC over the coming months and years will also be monitored and assessed.

91. In terms of interaction with the NDA, EA is actively engaged in the life time plan and funding process as far as is reasonable and will continue to do so. EA is also actively engaged with the NDA on the strategy development process and EA continues to provide advice wherever possible.
92. Mr Mayall reported that radioactive discharges to the Irish Sea continue to be relatively low compared to historic levels. The discharges now are 100s of times lower than they were during the peak years of the 1970's. The discharges in 2007 were the lowest on record, which meant that many of the targets in the UK discharge strategy for 2020 have already been met; but Sellafield Ltd and EA need to remain vigilant to ensure that situation remains. Clearly as reprocessing has the potential to go back up to more normal levels, this will have an impact on discharges and there is the potential for various clean-up projects to also cause small increases. There will therefore continue to be fluctuations over the next few years in what has been an overall long term decreasing trend.
93. Referring to page 6 of his report on EA's current annual review of the radioactive substances authorisation at Sellafield, Mr Mayall reported that EA carry out an annual review to ensure the authorisation is up-to-date and fit for purpose. One particular issue that has arisen this year is in relation to the discharges of a radionuclide known as antimony 125; it is discharged almost entirely by the Fuel Handling Plant at Sellafield, which is a storage and decanning facility for Magnox fuel. Because of a shift in the Magnox Operating Programme (MOP) to higher burn-up fuel, particularly from places like Wylfa, there has been a slight increase in discharges of this particular radionuclide to atmosphere. It is a volatile radionuclide, not easily abated, the radiological impact from it is very small, compared to a lot of the other radionuclides. Mr Mayall continued that Sellafield has applied to EA for an increase in the limit for that particular substance which it is considering at the moment. Because it relates to a site limit, which is a limit for overall site discharges, EA would normally go out to consultation which is wider than the normal minimum statutory consultee level. Mr Mayall stated that the purpose of highlighting it at the meeting is that EA believe the impact of this change will be small and it will allow Magnox fuel decanning and reprocessing to continue as planned. He stated that if there was any feedback from members and members of the public on the extent to which they believe EA should consult on this issue, then he would welcome the feedback, particularly bearing in mind that a lot of the local community is being consulted on all sorts of things at the moment, he was very keen to ensure the consultations are kept fit for purpose, hitting the important issues; Mr Mayall welcomed thoughts.
94. In terms of team inspection Mr Mayall reported one was carried out on environmental monitoring at Sellafield in February, no major compliance issues were identified but EA will be compiling a report with some recommendations. Mr Mayall stated that it was fair to say that Sellafield has one of the best environmental monitoring programmes of any nuclear site in the country and EA is very keen to maintain that.

95. Mr Mayall confirmed that with regards to beach monitoring and radioactive particles on the beach, that programme continues. The Health Protection Agency advice remains as was, i.e. no special precautionary measures are required in terms of beach use. The programme of monitoring will continue into the next financial year, including improvements to the monitoring techniques, which will further enhance its capability.
96. Mr Mayall reported that there had been a number of issues relating to contamination events on the site in the past few months and EA is engaged in a number of investigations in relation to those issues and hopefully will be in a position in a forthcoming meeting to report back on those investigations.
97. Mr Raaz had already covered a lot of points in relation to the Low Level Waste Repository, Mr Mayall thought it was sufficient to say that an important milestone in that will be 2011 when the environmental safety case submission will be made and then it will be up to EA and assessors to look at that over the course of the following year or two, to come to a conclusion about further disposals at the site. That will be an important milestone.
98. Mr Mayall reported that there were many consultations in the pipeline at the moment, in relation to LLWR. EA will shortly be going out to consultation on authorisations for the LLWR to transfer onwards low level waste for treatment and likewise from any nuclear site in this country; EA is proposing to put in place authorisations which will allow the transfer of waste to LLWR for onward transfer for treatment.
99. EA is also expecting an application from Waste Recycling Group and Energy Solutions about the proposed landfill of high volume, very low level radioactive waste at the Lillyhall landfill site. When that is received there will be another consultation exercise.
100. In conclusion Mr Mayall highlighted that the national low-level waste strategy will be going out for consultation later this month.
101. **Paul McKenna:** You make reference to the obviously very low level of discharges to the marine environment from Sellafield and we all applaud that but with regards to the present position, would you not agree that an educated technical assessment of where we are against achieving the UK Government Ospar commitment of close to zero discharges by 2020; what we're talking about is a degree of deferred discharges which will occur in the period 2010-2020; bearing in mind the state of corrosion products and other things to be solved in the Magnox plant; wouldn't you say an educated technical assessment would say there'll be at least some slight increase in those marine discharges in the period 2010-2020.
102. **Andy Mayall:** Yes I agree, as I indicated when I first spoke, the figures will be subject to fluctuation, there's still a lot of work to go on at the site. We shouldn't be complacent; there are things that still can be done to abate those potentially fluctuating discharges. For a start reprocessing rates have been fairly low recently, and therefore a return to more normal levels will lead to an increase in discharges, and there are some legacy waste issues to be dealt with which may

also cause small increases in discharges; but you can rest assured we'll make sure that all that is done in an optimised fashion to minimise discharges, or even prevent them if possible.

103. **Martin Forwood:** Page 13 can you clarify please, you mention the new evaporators – ‘to ensure they can continue to reprocess spent Magnox and AGR fuel’ should that also include LWR fuel?

104. **Andy Mayall:** Yes it should, that is an omission.

AGENDA ITEM 11 – SUMMARY REPORTS FROM THE SUB COMMITTEES

105. **David Moore:** Mr Moore asked the Chairmen of the sub committees if they wanted to add anything to their reports and then intended to take questions on each of the reports.

106. **John Haywood:** apologised for the report as there had been transitional difficulties. This report was a condensation of the committee’s press release and the press release was a condensation of what had happened and some of the things that didn’t happen; so it was less informative than he would have wished.

107. Updating the actions Professor Haywood reported that one action was to raise the issue of timely publication of the RIFE report, and he reminded everyone that about a decade ago, the equivalent of the RIFE report did not appear until the second year after the year in which the data was collected. He was anxious to avoid a return to that practice and so the relationship between publication dates and meeting dates would be discussed at the next Environmental Health sub committee meeting.

108. The other action was to seek COMARE’s advice (Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment) on a recent study of childhood cancer near nuclear power stations in Germany. Professor Haywood contacted the COMARE Chairman about this study and he had informed him that the data of COMARE’s 11th report have been re-analysed using the same methodology as the German study. This re-analysis did not support the German conclusions and a meeting is being held in Germany to review the original study. He will provide information on the outcome of that meeting when he gets it.

109. **Janine Allis-Smith:** Why were the minutes so late, I would have asked him this question about what was happening about this presentation about COMARE, but the minutes did not appear until about a week ago, so there was no time. I read in your constitution that minutes were to be published within 15 days of them taking place.

110. **John Haywood:** I think this is one of the transitional difficulties that I referred to and I apologise without reservation for that oversight.

111. **David Moore:** We’ll take that on board and ensure that this doesn’t happen again, there were one or two hiccups this time with the transition, so we’ll ensure

that those reports aren't delayed in future. We'll move on next to the Decommissioning sub committee.

112. **Norman Clarkson:** Decommissioning is going forward efficiently and safely and to that end, I'm very pleased to take on board on the committee, Russ Mellor, Senior Executive who wishes to join the committee; so again that demonstrates to me and to the rest of the committee, the commitment that Sellafield are showing to decommissioning. We've heard about the legacy ponds and silos being top priority and we are having a site visit to that area. There will also be another report coming, as we're calling an extraordinary sub committee meeting in May, specifically to hear a report given by Paul Foster on the site performance; hopefully this will help the measuring and monitoring of the decommissioning much better.
113. **David Moore:** With regards to the site visit, if any other members want to go on the site visits, they'd be very welcome. When Chairmen are calling extraordinary meetings, can they ensure that they inform the secretariat, so that we can publicise the meeting and get information out to members of the public.
114. **Henry Wormstrup:** I absolutely 100% support the NDA skills strategy and I understand Energus at Lillyhall is near completion, it would be an excellent opportunity for the WCSSG members to visit Energus to see the excellent investment for the people of West Cumbria.
115. **Ian Hudson:** We took ownership of the Energus facility this last week and it's pretty much complete. The graduate programme was highlighted at the decommissioning sub committee and I thank the comments that were made at that sub committee meeting. The NDA graduate programme has made a very successful start; one of our targets was for it to be listed in the 'Times 100' top graduate programmes. That list is published later this year and we remain confident that this new scheme will make an immediate impression on that list.
116. **David Moore:** We now move on to the Commercial sub committee.
117. **Mike Davidson:** It was a very detailed meeting and a number of searching questions were asked, the answers to which you can see in the report. What I would welcome is a greater attendance from people other than those who are actually submitting a report to the committee. We would really like some more people to come long and help us with the questioning.
118. **David Moore:** We do encourage people to come along and attend these meetings. It is quite disappointing sometimes the attendance at meetings and questions get asked after the meeting. The appropriate time is to come along to the meetings and get involved. That's what we're hoping people will do; there'll be more detailed work in these scrutiny sub committees; so please make every effort to attend. We now move on to the Socio Economic sub committee.
119. **Elaine Woodburn:** Henry prompted me to say that we did agree at our last socio economic sub committee to hold our next special meeting at the Energus facility.

120. **David Moore:** We now move on to the Emergency Planning sub committee and the Chairman doesn't have anything to add. Finally we have the LLWR sub committee.

121. **Sue Brown:** Nothing more to add.

AGENDA ITEM 12 – DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

122. **David Moore:** The Chairman confirmed the next event of the WCSSG was 2nd July at the Sellafield Visitors Centre.

123. The next full scrutiny meeting will be Thursday 1st October 09 at Cleator Moor Civic & Masonic Centre.

124. The Chairman closed the meeting and wished members and observers a safe journey home.