

**MINUTES OF THE 7th SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE  
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP  
HELD AT CLEATOR MOOR CIVIC & MASONIC CENTRE  
ON THURSDAY 2nd OCTOBER 2008**

**Amended version – point 42 amended 4/11/08 to reflect clarification from DfT**

**Present:**

|                      |   |                                      |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Dr Colin Hill        | - | Churches Forum                       |
| Mr R Hargreaves      | - | Community Member                     |
| Prof Steve Jones     | - | Westlakes Research Institute         |
| 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            | - | UKAEA                                |
| Cllr Elaine Woodburn | - | Copeland Borough Council             |
| Mr David Moore       | - | Chairman                             |
| Mr Barry Snelson     | - | Sellafield Ltd                       |
| Dr Ian Hudson        | - | Nuclear Decommissioning Authority    |
| Cllr M Davidson      | - | Allerdale Borough Council            |
| Mr J A Clark         | - | UKAEA Prospect                       |
| Mr Tony Jones        | - | Prospect Union                       |
| Mr P Kane            | - | GMB Union                            |
| Dr P McKenna         | - | Isle of Man Government               |
| M/s Shirley Williams | - | WCSSG Secretary                      |
| Mr David Humphreys   | - | Senior Emergency Planning Officer    |
| Mr P A Daley         | - | Allerdale Borough Council            |
| Mr Henry Wormstrup   | - | Whitehaven & District Trades Council |
| Mr Ranald Stewart    | - | Ponsonby Parish Council              |
| Mr Mike McMullen     | - | Studsvik                             |
| Dr Sohail Ashraf     | - | Health Protection Authority          |
| Mr Dick Raaz         | - | Low Level Waste Repository           |
| Mr Bob Jones         | - | Sellafield Ltd                       |
| Cllr A Holliday      | - | Copeland Borough Council             |
| Mr R Wright          | - | Gosforth Parish Council              |
| Mr K Opie            | - | Fire & Rescue                        |
| Supt. Phil Bishop    | - | Civil Nuclear Constabulary           |
| Mrs June Shield      | - | Secretariat                          |

## **CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the seventh 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 reported that a number of members were unable to attend, some of which had sent along representatives, he welcomed the representatives to the meeting. He also welcomed several new members to the committee.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 03 APRIL 2008**

4. The Chairman asked if there were any amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 03 April 08.
5. An amendment had been made to paragraph 199 of the minutes by Andy Mayall of the Environment Agency and members had been notified. Following the amendment the minutes were accepted as a true record.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 6th MEETING**

6. There were no matters arising.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 4 – REPORT FROM THE WCSSG CHAIRMAN**

7. The Chairman took the opportunity to express his disappointment at the low level of attendance at the various sub committees, urging members to make every effort to attend. If any members had any issues or suggestions with regards to the various sub committees, they were invited to feed these in through the secretariat.
8. He referred to members submitting reports to the scrutiny meetings and reminded them of the constitutional requirements of submitting reports in enough time to allow early distribution. The secretariat had experienced difficulty in meeting deadlines, because of the late submission of several reports.
9. He informed members of a Plutonium disposition workshop that is being hosted by the NDA and he expressed his disappointment that the WCSSG had only been offered one place; especially in light of the fact that most of the Plutonium is stored at Sellafield. Professor Steve Jones will represent WCSSG at the NDA's workshop. To address this situation, it has been decided that the WCSSG will hold a separate workshop on 28<sup>th</sup> October. This workshop will be open to the public and the Chairman urged as many people as possible to attend.
10. He also advised that West Lakes Renaissance would like an opportunity to present to WCSSG on New Build, and a further consultation meeting to accommodate this request will hopefully be arranged before Christmas.

11. The Chairman then welcomed Dr Ian Hudson of the NDA and commented that he was pleased to see that the NDA had submitted a report, rather than a powerpoint presentation.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 5 – REPORT FROM DR IAN HUDSON, NDA**

12. **Dr Hudson:** started by committing to improve the NDA's attendance at the various sub committee meetings. He had brought some colleagues with him, to help address any questions. He took his report as being read and asked for any questions.
13. **Henry Wormstrup:** referred to the NDA's report and asked what CSR meant, he also asked about the efficiencies quoted in the report of £110 million. He was under the impression that the SLC had reported that there had been no efficiencies and therefore no bonus.
14. **Barry Snelson:** explained that CSR was Comprehensive Spending Review and suggested that any reports should try to avoid the use of acronyms. Perhaps an updated list of acronyms could be put on the website.
15. He explained that the method of paying the bonus had been declared and that last year fee was paid to BNFL against Performance Based Indicators, whereas this year, the fee had been waived to assist in managing a tight budget.
16. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that 24<sup>th</sup> November (share transfer) is a very important date and that a long term transition plan is needed. She also asked about whether the short term transition plan could be made available.
17. **Ian Hudson:** replied that he could not comment on behalf of the new PBO, but that he would take an action to provide a short term transition plan.
18. **Joe Clark:** Commented that he was concerned about the tone of the NDA's report and that he felt there was a lack of direction. He also commented that the document infers that there is no current plan for the decommissioning of Sellafield. He asked about the sale of land/assets surrounding the Sellafield site and the funding of the NHS by the NDA.
19. **Jim Morse:** Replied that there is a plan for decommissioning in terms of the work to be done. Nuclear Management Partners Ltd (NMPL) will have 18 months from November 25th to look through the entirety of the Sellafield operation; they will then share their plans for the site.
20. The NDA has been around for 3.5 years and one of their prime tasks is to bring in the competition that has now delivered NMPL, whilst gaining a greater knowledge of the estate. The NDA has to realise best value for government, i.e. asset realisation (not stripping). The NDA is not aware of the sale of any assets around Sellafield or the LLWR.
21. With regards to the funding of cottage hospitals, it was the third year payment of the original £17M that had been committed.

22. **Tony Jones:** commented that Evaporator D has an influence on Thorp and jobs within that plant. There has been a lot of effort to bring Evaporator D on line and it seems to have been stalled.
23. **Ian Hudson:** stated that Evaporator D is a key plant in supporting reprocessing and high level waste strategies and that the NDA is committed to the project. The NDA sanctioning process is not a block to progress.
24. **Jim Morse:** Evaporator D is not yet at stage gate 3, it hasn't stalled at stage gate 3, it hasn't got there yet; and that's anticipated during October. Evaporator D would seem on the face of it to be straight forward, after all there's an evaporator A, B and C, so what's the issue about a fourth evaporator? Engineering is never quite that simple, A, B & C are all markedly dissimilar, because they've had to face different challenges in their life. Evaporator D is a challenge in a number of areas, not least of which is meeting the technical and safety challenges, but it's also a challenge in a number of other areas like cost. The cost of Evaporator D is now larger than was originally forecast. It always seems that when a manager says a project has cost more than it did before, that's necessarily a bad thing. Maybe it's not a project out of control, maybe it's actually a project that's becoming under control, so greater transparency about the real outturn cost of that project and as it progresses, a more realistic view of the risks and the overall cost. It will be a challenge for Barry, Ian and I, in presenting that argument to our funders in government, who expected a different number. It's gone up in cost, it's probably gone out in schedule, and that's not really a challenge in funding per say; more of a challenge to ensure that Sellafield Ltd continue to run down the highly active liquor stocks, whilst A, B & C continue to run out of usable life; we need to make sure there is a real big margin of safety involved in that and that's all part of the plan. So there are some challenges around Evaporator D, just as there are challenges around all of the forefront projects on Sellafield site. With Evaporator D we've clearly seen a whole new level of project management, which has been really good to see and will underpin that bit for extra money, which is on top of all the money for the rest of this year, that we'll have to try and seek from Government.
25. **Barry Snelson:** commented that Evaporator D is proceeding up to FEL gate 3. It is a complex project which has had its ups and downs, but funding has not been stopped.
26. **Tony Jones:** So any delay is due to technical issues, not strategy?
27. **Barry Snelson:** Yes.
28. **Jim Morse:** With a project of this size and we are talking several hundred million pounds, Government & the Treasury will seek to assure Ministers that the current method is best value for money and they will look to the NDA to see what assurance we can provide, what issues we have and what risks and opportunities we see. Treasury may also seek to have others review the project. It certainly won't be an easy sell to Government, we in the NDA are ensuring that they're all on alert and are watchful of the project, so that it passes through the stage gate and Government's gate as smoothly and rapidly as possible; but I certainly couldn't say it's a done deal by any means. There's going to have to be

a good deal of explanation and communication around the necessity for Evaporator D and extra evaporative capacity; and assurance that this is the right cost, given that it's increased twofold.

29. **Elaine Woodburn:** referred to the mention in the NDA's report of the OGC (Office of Government Commerce) and their commendation of the handling of the competition process. She asked whether this commendation took into account stakeholder and employee involvement.
30. **Ian Hudson:** replied that engagement was one of the criteria and that from the review, the evaluation criteria involved employee representatives; but that he would look at the review.
31. **Martin Forwood:** remarked that he couldn't understand why the NDA has not, yet again, included in its report any information on INS (International Nuclear services). CORE has been asking for years to get the transport side of this business brought before this committee and again there's absolutely no reference to it. This is surprising because there have been one or two major events over the last few months; one of which was the Plutonium shipment to France in May that resulted in a Prohibition Notice being put on Sellafield by the DfT for some irregularities in the transport regulations. Secondly, can you give us a date when the Sellafield Lifetime Plan 2008 is likely to be available to members of the public? Thirdly, with regards to Evaporator D, surely the real question is when do you see Evaporator D actually coming on line?
32. **Barry Snelson:** commented that with regards to the Prohibition Notice, regulators are involved, so the safety element is being properly integrated. There is a willingness to review and hopefully the new PBO will also bring in some ideas. Sellafield and the NDA are working a pathway forward that suits British taxpayers both funds wise and safety wise.
33. With regards to Evaporator D, all parties are working together to find the best solution and we can look forward to the contribution the new PBO will add to this process.
34. **Ian Hudson:** In relation to the report and the feedback on its content, I understand this is the first time that the NDA has submitted a written report and so I very much welcome any comments back. As for INS issues, I understand that these are discussed at another sub committee meeting, but for the future we will take an action to include information about INS.
35. **Jim Morse:** In terms of the publication of the Lifetime Plan, it has become clear during the last three years that there are a number of challenges on Sellafield, but one is clearly about the cost of operation, asset maintenance and decommissioning and the Life Cycle liabilities of the entire site. During the past year, Barry & his team have reassessed the cost of all of those plans and looking in the near term, so this year and the next two years; have identified a sizeable requirement for additional funds. Additional in Government size, in terms of what they've allocated in something called CSR07. The Comprehensive Spending Review is the way Government decides its budgets and Government bodies can then commit against those budgets and Government does that usually

in three year cycles. CSR07 represents the three years commencing 1<sup>st</sup> April 08, Government allocate an amount of money to Sellafield; and at the same time Barry & his team have looked in more depth at performance, liabilities and asset maintenance and they have concluded that there are additional sums of money required. For that reason, the NDA and Sellafield Ltd have put to one side, for the moment, the new Life Time Plan 08 for Sellafield. Between Sellafield Ltd & the NDA, there is a very dedicated, knowledgeable team working on how to get through the next two or three years, of that given funding versus the new projection of funding' so how do we close what is a sizeable gap? Until that's done, there is no point reviewing, recycling and issuing a new Life Time Plan. So we have to close the gap and we'd like to do that within the next few months; and that's what Sellafield and the NDA team are driving towards. But even given the shorter term horizon, contractually, NDA and the New PBO have agreed an 18 months period, during which Sellafield Ltd under their new owner, will scrub through that Life Time Plan that exists. So a new Life Time Plan for the entirety of Sellafield, will probably not be available for 12-18 months.

36. **David Moore:** Just for clarification, INS does report to the Commercial sub committee meetings, if anyone requires further detail on transport issues.
37. **Tim Knowles:** Whilst I'm desperately worried about the Treasury and the UK taxpayer, I'm a lot more worried about Cumbrian taxpayers and the Cumbrian economy. Given what's been said there are potentially some major changes to programmes of work, the impact on the workforce, the impact on the Cumbrian economy and the supply chain. I hope that through the Commercial sub committee, of which I am a member, but also more directly with officers of the local authorities and other organisations; that we can have an open dialogue on what the implications of this are going to be. The impact of major changes are huge in this area, and Sellafield is 50% of the Copeland economy. It would be churlish of me not to recognise, after my heavy criticism at the last meeting, of the NDA's presentation; which was woeful at the last meeting, how much better the written report this time is and to congratulate Ian and the team for their frankness and openness and let's hope that this continues and develops in the future.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6 – REPORT FROM BARRY SNELSON, SELLAFIELD LTD**

38. **David Moore:** before introducing the next item wanted to thank Barry Snelson and his team for their professionalism and willingness in always attending the stakeholder meetings, they have always been open to scrutiny and excellent in providing information and answering any questions.
39. **Barry Snelson:** thanked the Chairman for his kind words and presented his report for the last time covering safety as always, his first priority. The site is on target to achieve its best ever safety and environmental performance; however conventional safety continues to be dominated by events such slips, trips and falls. A campaign is being planned to address the root causes and to raise awareness. He then went on to cover operational performance, explaining that several plants were in outages.

40. He reported that Windscale were now well integrated into Sellafield Ltd and had completed a project in the Windscale Advanced Gas cooled Reactor (WAGR), well ahead of schedule; which resulted in substantial efficiency savings and the achievement of a Performance Based Incentive (PBI).
41. **Martin Forwood:** asked what the position is over the Prohibition Notice on Plutonium transports, as he understood that Sellafield was appealing against the Prohibition Notice. Has that appeal been heard, or when is it going to be heard, what's the outcome?
42. **Barry Snelson:** Sellafield Ltd lodged an appeal against a prohibition notice issued by an Inspector of the Department of Transport on 9th July 2008. At Liverpool Employment Tribunal on 19 September 2008, by consent, the Prohibition Notice was affirmed with a modified schedule. Accordingly, the appeal against the Prohibition Notice and the application for its suspension by Sellafield Ltd. were treated as withdrawn by the tribunal.

The Prohibition Notice remains extant and will continue to be so until the DfT is satisfied that Sellafield Ltd has taken all steps necessary to ensure future compliance with relevant statutory provisions in relation to the matters mentioned in the notice.

Plutonium shipments cannot currently resume; nor have the requirements of the notice been met.

43. **Martin Forwood:** wanted to echo what the chairman had said earlier and wanted to put on record that CORE had been attending these meetings for almost 20 years now, and Barry Snelson has been the best of the best, in terms of getting information out of Barry, either in the community or over a cup of tea. CORE are very, very grateful to Barry for that and just hope that Barry's successors will carry on in the same light.
44. **Barry Snelson:** thanked Martin for his very kind words.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 7 – Mike McMullen, Studsvik**

45. **Mike McMullen:** introduced himself and explained that this was the first time that Studsvik had attended this meeting as a member. Mr McMullen is relatively new to his role at Studsvik and thus promised to endeavour to answer any questions raised from his report, or at the very least to ensure answers were made available and would be fed back via the secretariat.
46. **Henry Wormstrup:** commended Studsvik for including a section in their report on socio economic issues and asked whether a report could be given to the committee on how other members of the supply chain address socio economic issues.
47. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that a long time had been spent carrying out work with LLWR to secure a community package and enquired as to whether Studsvik would be securing one also. She also invited Studsvik to become members of the socio economic sub committee, if they so wished.

48. **Shirley Williams:** commented that a lot of the supply chain would like to fulfil a role in CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) and that a Social Investment strategy for West Cumbria would provide a series of options which would help the supply chain make an informed contribution. Feedback will be provided through the socio economic sub committee.
49. **Martin Forwood:** expressed his amazement as to why Studsvik were opening a facility at Lillyhall, when they are already part of the consortium running the LLWR at Drigg. It would have made far more sense for their operation to be at Drigg, it would have cut out a number of unnecessary transports.
50. **Mike McMullen:** replied that Studsvik at Lillyhall is not reliant on Sellafield or the LLWR and that a feasibility study had been carried out when deciding to operate from Lillyhall.
51. **Dick Raaz:** commented that LLWR's mission is to carry out the LLW strategy, not to market work to companies such as Studsvik.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8 – MARK FOY, NUCLEAR INSTALLATIONS INSPECTORATE**

52. **Mark Foy:** presented his report and commented that the HSE are concerned about funding issues and also the continuation of safety during transition to a new PBO; he did however express his admiration at the dedication of staff. Shortfalls in available funding is impacting on projects on the Sellafield site and NII inspectors are meeting with people on site to discuss safety. They have also written to the NDA with regards to the delay to projects, due to funding issues. An Improvement notice has been served on Sellafield regarding Thorp's long term periodic review of safety. A second Improvement Notice has also been served in respect of an operator who received a puncture wound whilst working with PCM. Mr Foy also reported on an incident in WVP with regards to shield doors, which had serious safety implications and a Board of Inquiry has been convened.
53. **Mark Foy:** presented his report and commented that HSE inspectors continue to undertake their inspection activities on site, but a degree of HSE regulatory effort is still being focussed in two areas: Transition to the new PBO and Funding in relation to the Sellafield sites programme of work.
54. With regards to Transition, in August both HSE and EA were advised of a proposal to change the transition plan for replacing the current Sellafield Ltd Executive team with secondees from the preferred bidder NMPL. The change involved replacing the main body of the existing executive team at or around the same time as the transfer of shares to NMPL. HSE has indicated its concern to Sellafield Ltd regarding the late change to an agreed transition plan which was based on a phased approach. We have indicated that any change to the previously established phased approach will need to be substantiated on health, safety, security and environmental grounds. This substantiation has been received in the form of a revised Management of Change submission and is currently being reviewed by the Inspectorate.

55. The issue of continued safety during transition is very much HSEs concern and NIIs Chief Inspector (Dr Mike Weightman), and members of HSEs Board (including the chair Ms Judith Hackett) have visited Sellafield site over the last few months, meeting with the workforce, members of the current executive and latterly with the PBO preferred bidders team. They sought to gauge the impact transition was having on site. They were impressed by the dedication of staff at all levels, whilst also conveying a number of key messages, including the importance of good leadership and management at what is a very challenging time.
56. With regards to funding, in the quarterly report I have highlighted the issue of shortfalls in available funding when compared to the costs of the original scope of work identified by the licensee for the Sellafield site. This is impacting on the delivery of projects on the site and HSE is keen to ensure major hazard and risk reduction projects are progressed in a timely manner, hence we have maintained close oversight of the Life Time Plan developments. Along with the EA, we have engaged regularly with both the NDA and Sellafield Ltd on this issue, and we have agreed a 3 part approach with Sellafield Ltd on the development of an LTP for the site.
57. We have received and reviewed Sellafield Ltd’s first part of this – justify ongoing safety of the site for the current year – and it falls short of regulatory expectations. To address HSE concerns, inspectors are meeting with the SLC today to discuss the matter in detail.
58. Within the report I also mentioned the fact that the compliance dates associated with a number of specifications that HSE has in place on the site to secure progress in addressing hazards and risk are unlikely to be met. Consequently, in the prime area of concern, relating to ILW and the legacy facilities, we have recently written to Sellafield Ltd stating that protracted delays in addressing hazard potential and delivery of significant risk reduction measures are unacceptable and we have asked for a number of things from the licensee by 31<sup>st</sup> October, which will be used to inform our future regulatory enforcement decision in relation to these specifications.
59. The stakeholder group should also be aware that HSE has recently written to NDA on funding issues related to High Level Waste Plant projects, particularly the provision of new evaporative capacity and regulatory concern regarding delay to two particular programmes of work, which could potentially put delivery of the MOP and OOP at risk. We are keen to ensure that delays are not encountered and NDA has been asked to provide a justification of its current position to the regulator.
60. The HSE quarterly report already makes mention of the Improvement Notice issued on the contractor Stobbarts, other enforcement action taken over the last few months include:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Improvement Notice on Sellafield Ltd July 08 | Thorp Long Term Periodic Review of Safety – We were concerned about delays in completing the LTPR and implementation of the associated recommendations – The IN now ties in to the Sellafield Ltd programme for implementation of |
|--|---|

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | recommendations, effectively defining a programme that has to be completed by Sellafield Ltd declared dates.  |
| Improvement Notice on Sellafield Ltd July 08 | Waste Treatment and Decommissioning functional area – An operator received a puncture wound whilst working on Plutonium Contaminated Material. This was investigated by HSE and we found the licensee had been deficient in that he had not completed an adequate prior risk assessment. Therefore an IN was issued to ensure compliance with IRRs and MHSWR in this respect. |

61. Finally, the stakeholder group should be aware of an incident that occurred on Vitrification Line 3 last week, where inadvertent operation of a shielded trap door occurred between two active cells, no one was injured or received a radiological dose because of the incident, but the event does have serious safety implications. The site has convened its own Board of Inquiry and HSE inspectors have been on site this week looking to establish the details around the event. I will appraise the stakeholder group of the results of this at the next meeting.
62. **Henry Wormstrup:** questioned part of the NII's report that referred to the redundant flask strategy and asked what it was.
63. **Mark Foy:** replied that Sellafield Ltd were developing a strategy for dealing with redundant flasks which are currently "stored" across the Windscale site. Mark agreed to report back on the strategy.
64. **Paul McKenna:** referred to page 6 of the NII's report and asked what we being referred to when it mentioned the integrity of a pond structure?
65. **Mark Foy:** explained that it referred to sluice gates and an associated justification.
66. **Paul McKenna:** asked what would the timescale be for construction of further HASTs (highly active storage tanks), would it be a decade?
67. **Mark Foy:** replied it would be around a decade.
68. **Martin Forwood:** With regards to the Fuel Handling Plant, can you say what the current status of the AGR dismantler is now, is it still offline?
69. **Mark Foy:** replied it was still offline.
70. **Martin Forwood:** You go into some detail regarding evaporators which I find concerning, in essence out of three evaporators, two of them are working without their full compliment of cooling coils. I can't understand how you can assure people that the integrity of these evaporators is fine, when you're running on less than the number of coils that they were built with. Is this not a safety concern? To me it's just a sign that reprocessing at Sellafield is going to go on, come hell and high water and you need the evaporators for that.

71. **Mark Foy:** the requirement for cooling coils is a safety issue. However, the evaporators have a safety case that justifies safe operation and a feature of that safety case is redundancy of cooling coils.
72. **Martin Forwood:** if an evaporator is built with a certain number of cooling coils in it for a specific purpose, some of them have got two off now and some have three off, it can't be an ideal situation.
73. **Mark Foy:** It's all part of the defence in depth that is a feature of the safety case, which the plant operates within the boundaries of.
74. **Martin Forwood:** regarding the HALES overdue plant maintenance schedule items, some have been overdue over an extended time period, what is that time period?
75. **Mark Foy:** in the order of a year.
76. **Martin Forwood:** isn't that an awful long time?
77. **Mark Foy:** we are taking measures to ensure that HALES comes back in line in terms of the issues with the plant maintenance schedule.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 9 – ANDY MAYALL, ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**

78. **Andy Mayall:** Referred to the two most recent quarterly reports provided with the pack, which would be taken as read, and said that he would highlight a few items. He commented on the recent news regarding authorisations and permits, saying that the annual periodic review of the RSA authorisation has just begun. The Environment Agency is also consulting on a minor change to the EPR permit, which deals with non-radioactive discharges, with regard to the reduction in height of the stacks at Fellside CHP.
79. The Environment Agency has issued seven warning letters to the site since the last meeting, including one last week in relation to the serious corrosion found at the chimney stacks at the Fellside CHP in February 2008 – this was accompanied by an Enforcement Notice which requires improvements to maintenance and asset care.
80. In relation to environmental monitoring issues he began by giving a brief update on the beach monitoring programme. The monitoring vehicle broke down while on the beach in July and was subsequently submerged by the incoming tide, thus delaying the programme for a couple of months. The company is now using two machines in order to recover lost time on the programme. There is no change to the advice from the Health Protection Agency, which states that no special precautionary measures are needed in respect of beach usage. On November 25<sup>th</sup> there will be a multi-agency meeting to discuss the beach monitoring programme which is a follow on from the successful workshop in the summer 2007. COMARE has set up a sub-group on this issue and are visiting Sellafield next week.
81. The iodine-129 levels in milk measured close to the site by the operator, reported at the previous meeting to have been slightly elevated earlier this year, have

returned to normal i.e. less than detectable levels. On analysis of past data it appears that similar slight elevations have been noted before in winter months and that the recent results were within the fluctuation of levels seen over the long term.

82. The Environment Agency and the NII have written a joint letter to Sellafield Ltd, and copied to the NDA, expressing concern over the continual delays in decommissioning at the Sellafield site.
83. The Environment Agency is very supportive of the Decommissioning Sub Committee which has been set up recently. Decommissioning and hazard reduction should be the top priority on the Sellafield site.
84. With regards to the transition to the new PBO, we are working very closely with the NII in monitoring and assessing the transition and we have met with representatives of the new PBO to make sure they are aware of the Environment Agency's aims and expectations.
85. With regards to LLWR issues, we have recently received the interim post closure safety case submission, which is now being assessed. The final version is due for submission in 2011.
86. **Paul McKenna:** with regards to page 10 of your report covering the SIXEP Waste Retrieval project, is this a project which is still at the development stage and how are the wastes stored?
87. **Andy Mayall:** the sludge waste, generated since the start up of SIXEP in 1985, is stored in tanks. We would like to see conditioning of this waste start as soon as practicable in line with good radioactive waste management practice. Perhaps Barry could say more about the project?
88. **Barry Snelson:** These are purpose built tanks and the aim is to treat the waste via the encapsulation plants.
89. **Ron Hargreaves:** Referred to role of Environment Agency set out in the annex and its reference to the prevention of environmental impacts - did this rule out New Build?
90. **Andy Mayall:** No – it relates to the prevention or, where this is not practicable, the minimisation of impacts from any operation whether it be decommissioning or routine operation.
91. **Sue Brown:** the LLWR applied for consent to dispose of surface run-off water to Drigg Stream in July. This is required to enable construction work on Vault 9 to start, can you confirm if consent has been given?
92. **Andy Mayall:** Yes consent has been given.
93. **Sue Brown:** I chair the Ravensglass Coastal Partnership and this issue hasn't come before our group, who has been consulted on this?
94. **Andy Mayall:** promised to report back on this.

95. **Martin Forwood:** you describe rainwater as being significant and requiring consultation due to large volumes, what does significant mean in terms of this?
96. **Andy Mayall:** it's probably in relation to particular legislation and the fact that the site's in proximity to a SSSI and various other kind of conservation status areas.
97. **Martin Forwood:** in terms of volumes, have you any idea what those volumes are and more importantly, do they contain any radioactive contamination?
98. **Andy Mayall:** this particular consent is in relation to non-radioactive component. In terms of the volumes, I'd have to get back to you with the figures.
99. **Martin Forwood:** on page 8 of your report, regarding sealine maintenance enforcement notice, what is the position with that enforcement notice at the moment, is it being fully complied with or not?
100. **Andy Mayall:** we're still waiting for various follow-up actions, so no it's not closed out.
101. **Martin Forwood:** I would like to remind you Chairman and others, again that this enforcement notice was issued 20 months ago. How long do people need to comply with enforcement notices? Are enforcement notices strong enough tools for the agency to use.
102. **Andy Mayall:** the conditions of the enforcement notice have been met, but the follow-on work is still ongoing and the notice won't be closed out until that follow-on work is completed.
103. **Martin Forwood:** so the enforcement notice is effectively still in place, until it's fully complied with?
104. **Andy Mayall:** enforcement notices are not like prohibition notices, where the latter will need to be withdrawn to allow operations to resume if conditions have been complied with; enforcement notices do not necessarily get withdrawn by the initial deadlines if further work is identified to obtain further improvements. So in some cases it can go on longer than originally anticipated.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 10 – JOHN HAYWOOD, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE**

105. **John Haywood:** had not attended the last Environmental Health sub committee meeting, he therefore passed over to Prof. Steve Jones.
106. **Steve Jones:** reported that discharges to the environment in 2007 were slightly lower than in the previous year, in part because of limited reprocessing activity in the Thorp plant. Radiation doses to members of the public most highly exposed to the discharges were also slightly lower than the previous year, at about 190 microSieverts in the year for high rate consumers of local fish and shellfish, and about 17 microSieverts in the year for those living closest to the Sellafield site and consuming locally grown produce. These doses may be compared to the annual average dose from natural and medical sources of radiation in the UK, at

2500 microSieverts per year. The dose uptake from the dust from the Calder Hall cooling towers demolition, even for someone standing directly downwind, was only a fraction of 1 microSievert.

107. The Environment Agency and CORE have carried out a joint monitoring exercise in the Ravensglass estuary. This exercise has confirmed that the monitoring of external gamma radiation levels in the estuary, carried out routinely by the Agency, is adequately representative of the 'hot spots' reported by C.O.R.E in monitoring with their own instruments. However there is still debate as to whether the higher concentrations or radionuclides at depth in the sediments could give rise to any additional pathways of exposure, not covered by current monitoring programmes. Further work is required on this, and the Environment Agency will report on a review of sediment sampling and analysis at the next meeting.
108. We have reviewed membership of the sub committee and consider it matches our terms of reference, but we are concerned about attendance at meetings. Although the issues discussed at the sub committee meetings are often technical, there is still the need for a "lay" point of view. The next meeting of the sub committee will be held on 27<sup>th</sup> November, and all are welcome to attend. Steve Jones will be representing the WCSSG at the NDA's Plutonium workshop on 15 October and will feed any output into the workshop that the WCSSG are holding on the 28<sup>th</sup> October.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 11 – DAVID MOORE, EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE**

109. **David Moore:** reminded people that there is a new site siren system and that on 9<sup>th</sup> October there will be a site emergency exercise where the site siren will be sounded. He urged people to telephone the free phone telephone number that has been supplied, just to ensure that the system works correctly. Work is progressing with the new system and it is currently going through an evaluation process.
110. We have asked CNC to put any of their exercises through the emergency planning sub committee route, as there has been concern raised by the community about CNC exercises.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 12 – SUE BROWN, LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY SUB COMMITTEE**

111. **Sue Brown:** confirmed that two meetings have been held in July and September and although she hadn't been present at the last meeting, she would endeavour to update and answer questions.
112. For Vault 9 the initial preferred bidder Hanson's withdrew their offer which resulted in the contract being awarded to Birse Nuclear who sub-contract to Ghyll Scaur Quarry.

113. At the September meeting there was strong feeling that Drigg and Holmrook are going to experience more traffic. The Traffic Management Plan has been approved by full council and there were no formal objections.
114. The new security arrangements for LLWR are now in place.
115. **Elaine Woodburn:** commented that she had attended a meeting recently where the SLC were castigated for not using local suppliers. LLWR is an excellent example of how obstacles can be overcome and she congratulated the contractors for securing local suppliers.
116. **Question:** LLWR has another role and that is the National Waste Strategy, which we don't get any information on, can we have an update at the next meeting?
117. **Sue Brown:** commented that there was a lot of unhappiness at the decision to obtain aggregate from North Wales, when it could have been sourced from Millom. There will be more jobs for the south of Copeland and we are pleased that we managed to get so many lorries off the road. But when we discovered that Bentonite was coming from the North East, people were not happy.
118. **Dick Raaz:** 90% of transport movements are by rail. LLWR has a very close relationship with the village of Drigg and a lot of effort was put into ensuring that everyone was consulted with. It was a tight line between defending taxpayers money, the impact on the roads and villagers feelings. A huge amount of effort has gone into the Traffic Management Plan and I feel that we have come up with the right answer. A transportation study was part of our bid and so we carried out a formal transportation study, which will be reported to our next sub committee meeting, we will then bring it before this committee.
119. **Tim Knowles:** The County Council did agree the Traffic Management Plan. It went through an elaborate process to try and ensure that what was being proposed, was right for Cumbria and the area. There is no doubt in my mind that the site operators bent over backwards to minimise the amount of traffic, and indeed have incurred some substantial cost to the contract in doing so. I know there were objections and there still are objections; but let's put this into perspective, we're talking about an extra three vehicles a day. We aren't talking about an enormous flood of vehicles, and the fact is that one of the points that we had to balance, was that unless this material could be sourced in this way, then frankly the site operators would have legitimately had reason to go to outside of the county, to source the materials and that would have been a disaster. I think the site operators have behaved extremely generously to the local community, in any context; and I think that should be recognised as well. I know there's been a lot of hot air and a lot of extreme comments made, but the officers of the County Council took this issue very seriously, consulted very fully, particularly with the Borough Council as well and I'm very happy with the decision that was taken and I'll happily answer any questions on the issue, should they come from the usual sources.

**AGENDA ITEM 13 – ELAINE WOODBURN, SOCIO ECONOMIC SUB COMMITTEE**

120. **Elaine Woodburn:** said that there was nothing further to add to her written report, and to remind members that the socio economic sub committee is still in its infancy and therefore still finding its feet.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 14 – MIKE DAVIDSON, COMMERCIAL SUB COMMITTEE**

121. **Mike Davidson:** reported that the Commercial sub committee was also a relatively new sub committee. He took his report as being read and asked for any questions.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 15 – RON HARGREAVES, DECOMMISSIONING SUB COMMITTEE**

122. **Ron Hargreaves:** who was reporting on behalf of Norman Clarkson took the report as read. One of the agenda items of the second decommissioning meeting was the NDA Hazard Baseline and its possible influence on decommissioning strategy. Members realised the possibility that there may be tensions between the NDA's high level decommissioning strategy and the aims and objectives of the Sellafield site at a local level. However in the absence of an NDA representative, the matter could not be discussed.

123. **Mark Foy:** asked who the NDA's representative was for the Decommissioning sub committee.

124. **Ian Hudson:** responded that he would ensure that the NDA addressed the issue of providing representatives and deputies for all the sub committee meetings.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 16 – DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

125. **David Moore:** reminded people of the extra meeting in the form of a workshop, being held on 28<sup>th</sup> October and asked as many people as possible to attend. He confirmed that the workshop would be open to the public and to as wide an audience as possible.

126. The date of the next event of the WCSSG is on January 8th 09 – venue and format to be advised.

127. The next full scrutiny meeting will be April 2nd 09 at Whitehaven Civic Hall. With that the Chairman closed the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.