

Minutes of Meeting

| | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------|
| Client | UKAEA | Client Reference | 3000033273 |
| Our Reference | 14731 | Issued By | Daren Luscombe |
| Issue Number | 01 | Issue Date | 15 December 2006 |
| Meeting Date | 10 November 2006 | Location | Pentland Hotel, Thurso |
| Present at Meeting (Distribution Copies) | Steering Group: Bill Fernie Ian Clark Prof. Iain Baikie John Thurso Rick Nickerson | Highland Council (Chair) UKAEA Trades Unions KP Technologies MP for Caithness, Sutherland and Easter Ross KIMO UK | |
| | Consultant Team: Daren Luscombe | (Entec UK Ltd) | |
| | Observers: Phil Cartwright June Love June Macgregor Martin Howse | (UKAEA) (UKAEA) (UKAEA) (UKAEA) | |
| Apologies for Absence (Distribution Copies) | Paul Dale | (Scottish Environment Protection Agency) | |
| Additional Distribution (Distribution Copies) | UKAEA website | | |
| Project Name | Particles BPEO Consultation | | |
| Subject | EXTERNAL CONSULTATION STEERING GROUP MEETING | | |

Actions

1. INTRODUCTIONS, APOLOGIES AND AGENDA

Introductions were made noting that Martin Howse replaced Fiona Henderson as Project Manager for the particles BPEO consultation in June 2006.

Apologies were received from Paul Dale.

DL stated that Fred Barker had resigned from the Group due to taking up a new post with NuLeAf. DL noted that FB had kindly made comments on the forthcoming Stage 3 consultation process. BF asked if the group felt that FB needed to be replaced. After discussion it was agreed that it was not necessary to replace FB at this stage in the process. The group considered a letter should be sent to FB thanking him for his contribution.

1) Action: JL to write to Fred Barker to thank him for his contribution to the External Consultation Steering Group.

The agenda was accepted.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Page 1, 2 and 3 no comments.

Page 4: At the last meeting RN had queried how the issue of the BPEO's timescale was being addressed, i.e. was the BPEO to extend past the site decommissioning programme of 2036. This had not been noted in the minutes. PC noted that site end state leaves the site with a number of facilities, monitoring and management requirements. The particles issue can be included within these requirements post End State, even if this date is much earlier than 2036. IB asked if the site end state was a UKAEA or NDA end state. JL noted that it was a NDA's end state.

Page 5, 6 and 7 no comments.

Noting the above, the minutes were approved.

Review of actions (below):

| Action | Who | Status |
|--|------------|------------------------------------|
| JL to forward relevant information as and when arises regarding particles and any other relevant finds to IB | JL | Completed |
| Note high representation from the <16 age group, to revise wording in 5.2.1 of the Stage 2 analysis report and clarify issue around the socio-economic outreach group | DL | Completed |
| Address issues raised by SEPA regarding the Technical Résumé and ensure that SEPA and external stakeholders have the opportunity to see consultation material prior to use | PC | Ongoing / Technical Résumé revised |
| IB to be invited to observe the scoring panel | FH | Completed |
| IB to attend the scoring panel meetings as an observer | IB | Completed |
| Stage Three consultation process to be built and refined taking account of suggestions made | DL/JL/FH | Completed |

3. UPDATE ON ISSUES

3.1 Dounreay Particle Advisory Group

PC noted that the Dounreay Particles Advisory Group's report will be launched on 21 November 2006 at the Decommissioning and Environmental Remediation Centre

(DERC). The report will also be made available in hard copy and on the SEPA websites.

3.2 BPEO Scoring Panel

IB commented that he had attended the BPEO Scoring Panel meetings in July as an observer and was impressed with the thoroughness of the process. IB considered that any one party did clearly not prejudice the scoring and that all had contributed well. IB considered that the panels had been well run and facilitated. IB noted that all scoring panel members, observers and the workshop facilitator were asked at the end of the workshop to identify their preferred option. 60% of people chose the same option and is considered to be significant and worth noting. JL noted that this process but not the result was recorded in the meeting minutes so as not to prejudice any outcome of the consultation.

PC gave a presentation to update the ECSG on the following:

- Stakeholders (DPAG, COMARE, Landowners, SEPA)
- Particle finds
- BPEO process and scoring panel outcomes
- Next stages (DPAG report 3 issued and consultation process)

During the presentation, the following points were made.

Surveys: Beach access for surveys is currently good. A first survey of Murkle Beach and a second survey of Dunnet Beach have been carried out. Both surveys found no particles. Peedie Sands will be surveyed shortly.

Dunnet Beach signs: The signs at Dunnet Beach were discussed. JL noted that next year, factual signs will be in place that aim to allow the public to make an informed decision about using the beach. The signs will be developed with SEPA, the health service and Highland Council in consultation with private landowners.

Technical Resume: The Technical Resume has been revised and is currently being appraised by external reviewers DPAG and SEPA.

Geographical extent: The geographical extent of the particles issue was discussed. IB noted that the geographical extent and timescale of the various options should be noted and represented visually using maps in the Stage Three consultation materials.

High activity particles: RN asked what would happen if a particle of higher radioactivity were located onshore in a publicly accessible area i.e. excluding Dounreay Foreshore. PC noted that if a higher activity particle were found, SEPA would probably recalculate the risk assessment using existing practices.

Sandside beach monitoring: JT enquired about the new monitoring procedure at Sandside beach. PC noted that an improvement in area coverage had been achieved since the summer with a focus on the low tide region. There have been 73 particles

found on Sandside beach since monitoring started in 1984 (systematic monitoring since 1999), 17 in 2006 including three in the last week. It was believed that with improved equipment and increased monitoring more particles would be found, demonstrating the importance of continuous access for monitoring.

Option screening: RN stated that it is important that the public are made aware of the reasons for 'screening-out' of options by the BPEO Scoring Panel. PC stated that the option and combination screening matrices could be integrated into the consultation materials. RN and IB suggested that Appendix 1 of the Scoring Panel meeting minutes could be used as a poster at the exhibitions.

Option titles: IB was of the view that the titles of the options should be expanded and a visual aid used to explain what they mean in the consultation material. MH noted that this has been done.

BPEO remaining stages: DL clarified the remaining stages of the consultation and BPEO drafting prior to UKAEA making their recommendation to SEPA, the NDA and Scottish Executive.

Ownership of the particles issues: JT enquired who would own the particles issue if UKAEA were to lose the site licence contract and whether the particles BPEO would stay with UKAEA or go with the contract to run the site. PC noted that the particles BPEO would go with the contract to run the site.

Issues raised in the Stage Two consultation: RN enquired how issues raised during the Stage Two consultation that fall outside the BPEO will be addressed. PC noted that the issue of the diffuser decommissioning was being integrated with the particles project and that requests for assistance for community projects (e.g. showers at beaches) would be directed through the socio-economic activities of the site and the NDA.

2) Action: MH to consider the following regarding the consultation materials' content:

- **The geographical extent should be represented visually using maps**
- **The timescale of the various options should be noted**
- **Option screening and combined option screening matrices should be integrated**
- **Appendix 1 of the Scoring Panel meeting minutes could be used as a poster at the exhibitions**

4. STAGE THREE

4.1 Approach

DL noted that following comments from the group at the April meeting, the Stage Three process had been developed and a draft had been circulated. Comments had been received from and discussed with FB.

DL noted the objectives of Stage Three as follows:

- To present the BPEO options under consideration;
- Identify stakeholder views on UKAEA's preliminary scoring;
- Identify stakeholder views on the relative importance of the attributes (criteria) selected to compare options; and
- Identify stakeholder views on the importance of the potential impacts generated by the management option strategies.

DL noted that the main focus of Stage Three was on the third objective regarding the relative importance of the criteria to facilitate the generation of weighted scores.

DL described the main elements of Stage Three. The group discussed the approach.

4.2 Communications strategy

It was noted that the exhibitions and consultation should be promoted in local press prior to the week in which the exhibitions are held and that Orkney press should be included in the press strategy.

3) Action: JL to arrange for early promotion of the exhibitions and inclusion of Orkney press in the communications strategy

4.3 Workshops

RN noted that, other than the 'Technical Stakeholder' group, stakeholders involved in the workshops were local. RN asked whether there was a way to bring in participation from wider national stakeholders through a workshop or exhibition. The group discussed this issue. The group requested that to facilitate wider national consultation the following be carried out:

- Scope national stakeholders and pass list to ECSG for comment
- Send a letter to national stakeholders asking how they would prefer to be engaged: by questionnaire, attendance at an exhibition or attendance at a workshop. A provisional date for an exhibition or workshop would be noted

in the correspondence

- Review preferences and decide on the best way forward

4) Action: MH to co-ordinate stakeholder mapping and communication with national stakeholders regarding preferred engagement process

The group requested that an additional exhibition be held in conjunction with a meeting of the Highland Council.

5) Action: MH to add Highland Council exhibition to the programme

The group requested that Orkney Islands Council be invited to a workshop.

6) Action: MH ensure Orkney Islands Council are invited to participate in a workshop

The group requested that if possible, the Dounreay Stakeholder Group workshop is coordinated to coincide with a DSG meeting or a meeting of the DSG Environment Group.

7) Action: MH to coordinate the DSG workshop with a DSG meeting

The group requested that the 'Schools and Youth' workshop is planned to carefully select participants, targeting those involved in the outreach group and older pupils. IB suggested asking the Head Teachers to nominate pupils.

8) Action: MH to coordinate targeting of Schools and Youth workshop participants

RN asked how responses from under 18s would be weighted. DL noted that the output from the workshops would not be combined hence weighting is not necessary. Regarding questionnaire responses, DL noted that the sensitivity of results to responses from under 18s could be examined.

RN raised the question of whether, in the calculation of weighted scores in a BPEO, weights are set generically or for each option and suggested that from his experience with the LLW process that weighted scores were applied to each option and in his view this method should also be applied to this process. Clarification could not be provided at the meeting. Post meeting note: UKAEA practice is to multiply the option criteria scores by the criteria weights to calculate the weighted scores of the options. Criteria weights are held constant and are not changed for each option.

9) Action: MH to clarify UKAEA BPEO weighting process

The group noted that the workshop timings could be adjusted to take account of stakeholder routines (e.g. school runs). This was noted and will be considered in the scheduling of the workshops.

4.4 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was discussed. DL noted that a questionnaire has not been used by UKAEA at this stage in a BPEO consultation, as the level of consultation is more suited to the deliberative process of workshops. The questionnaire had been compiled following the ECSG's request to facilitate comment from all stakeholders in Stage Three. DL noted that various scoring formats had been trialled in arriving at that presented in the draft.

The group considered the first two questions regarding options that have been screened out or in as not relevant at Stage Three and requested that they be removed. Following debate the group requested that the questions were limited to the following:

- A question regarding the respondent's top 3 option combinations (redraft of question 4)
- A question regarding the respondent's least favoured option (redraft of question 5)
- The criteria weighting question as currently drafted

DL noted that the results of the criteria weighting question may be used as a test-bed and may be compared to the outcomes of the workshop to ascertain the potential for using a questionnaire approach as part of consultation processes in future BPEOs.

10) Action: DL to redraft the questionnaire

4.5 Consultation materials

It was noted that the draft consultation materials (newsletter and exhibition storyboard) will be revised in light of comments from the group. The following further comments were made by the group:

- The layout of the options table was clearer in the storyboard than that in the newsletter and is preferred
- Consideration of including summary impacts and costs in the newsletter should be made
- Consideration of including the option screening information as an insert in the newsletter should be made
- RN suggested that the 'What happens next?' section of the newsletter could be moved to above the 'More information' section

11) Action: MH to consider above comments in redrafting the consultation materials

4.6 FB's comments

RN asked whether all of FB's comments on the approach had been considered. DL confirmed that they had.

As a post meeting note, a summary of FB's comments and Entec's response are noted below:

1. *What form of weighting exercise will be undertaken between the questionnaire responses and the workshops?* Information from the questionnaire and workshops will not be weighted and combined but will be set out and compared alongside each other. Information from the questionnaire and each workshop will be separately entered into a multi-criteria analysis tool to generate a series of model runs. The model includes a swing-weighting function.
2. *It is challenging to find ways of enabling stakeholders to comment meaningfully on scores.* It was agreed that this was the case (it took the scoring panel three days to determine the scores). It is proposed to discuss the scoring process at the workshops and some stakeholders may wish to raise points regarding certain scores however, detailed comment on scores is not proposed.
3. *The agenda for the workshops looks ambitious.* This was noted and timings will be examined.
4. *Stakeholders will need to know how decisions will be taken, in particular how the outputs from the multi-criteria assessment will be used.* This is noted and will be addressed in the newsletter and workshops.

5. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting is to be confirmed. The date is likely to be in the first two weeks of May 2007

6. AOB

There was no other business