

Minutes of Meeting

Client	UKAEA	Client Reference	3000033273
Our Reference	14731	Issued By	Daren Luscombe
Issue Number	01	Issue Date	25 May 2006
Meeting Date	25 April 2006	Location	Pentland Hotel, Thurso
Present at Meeting (Distribution Copies)	Steering Group: Bill Fernie (Chair) Ian Clark Iain Baikie Rick Nickerson		
	Consultant Team: Daren Luscombe (Entec UK Ltd)		
	Observers: Paul Dale (Scottish Environment Protection Agency) Phil Cartwright (UKAEA) Max Edington (UKAEA) June Love (UKAEA) Fiona Henderson (Consultant embedded in UKAEA)		
Apologies for Absence (Distribution Copies)	Fred Barker John Thurso		
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 Phil Cartwright replaced Frank Dennis as Senior Project Manager for the particles programme of work in April 2006 and Max Edington, the Manager for the 'Balance of Site Decommissioning' which incorporates particles issues. Fiona Henderson has been in place as Assistant Project Manager based at UKAEA since July 2005.

RN expressed concern that the period between the ECSG meetings (11 March 2005 – 25 April 2006) was too long and that e-mail correspondence was not as effective as in person. DL agreed that the gap between meetings was not ideal; however, the 25 April meeting was at the correct point in the project schedule and that the length of time between the

meetings resulted from the project being placed on hold following the particle find at Dunnet Bay. It was also noted that timescales for document revisions were such that meetings were not always possible for document review. FH took note of RN's comments for future arrangements with the ECSG.

Apologies were noted from John Thurso and Fred Barker.

The agenda was accepted.

2. MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

Page 1: no comments

Page 2: IB noted that no information had been forwarded regarding the 'stone'. PD confirmed that following further analysis, the item was plastic and that it was likely although not possible to confirm that its origin was Dounreay.

1) Action: JL to forward relevant information as and when arises regarding particles and any other relevant finds to IB

JL

IB enquired who owned the Technical Implementation Document (TID). PD clarified that SEPA owned the TID and in accordance with the TID, the offshore monitoring programme had commenced in April 2005.

Page 3: no comments

Page 4: IB noted that it was disappointing that DPAG had not accepted the request for IB to attend the DPAG meetings as an observer.

Page 5: It was questioned whether bi-monthly reports were needed. Quarterly reports from UKAEA to keep the Group informed of progress were proposed.

2) Action: FH to arrange for brief quarterly reports to be forwarded to the ECSG including status of actions from the ECSG minutes

FH

Review of actions (below):

Action	Who	
Ensure information noted in section 1 is included in consultation materials.	GM	Completed
Revise the executive summary and introduction of the Technical Résumé.	FD	Completed
Develop role description of and independent expert for the Stage 3 workshops	DL	Completed
Consider how beach visitors (from outside Caithness) might be included in the consultation.	DL&AM	Addressed through inclusion of those outwith Caithness on stakeholder mailing list. To be considered further for Stage 3.
Copy the bi-monthly consultant project management reports to the ECSG members.	GM	Action closed (revised to quarterly reports, see above)
Forward publicly available information regarding Particles and the Dunnet Beach stone to IB.	JL	Action closed (replaced by action 1 above)
Revise the newsletter text taking into account the comments made.	GM	Completed
Include a 2-page document on the Dunnet Beach stone with the mailed consultation materials and on the website.	JL	Closed (not pursued following particle find at Dunnet)
Make available additional information regarding the outcome of the 2003 exhibition.	JL	Completed

Noting the above, the minutes were accepted.

3. UPDATE ON ISSUES

It was noted that the Health Protection Agency's reports were now available. PD briefly described the rationale for the modules and approach taken. PD explained that the focus for the work was Sandside Bay and that the model could be updated if new information arises.

PD confirmed that the launch date for the DPAG final report is scheduled for 5 September 2006.

4. STAGE TWO CONSULTATION REVIEW

4.1 Entec reports

DL summarised the process and noted the main emerging issues from the analysis of the Stage Two stakeholder engagement. The draft Stage Two documents '*Analysis of the December 2005 – January 2006 stakeholder engagement*' and '*Record of January 2006 exhibitions and outreach*'

meetings' were discussed.

The ECSG congratulated UKAEA and Entec project team for the work carried out in Stage Two (the December 2005 – January 2006 stakeholder engagement). RN commented that he considered the work groundbreaking in the nuclear industry due to its inclusion and involvement of stakeholders being drawn from the public rather than more typical consultation involving often consulted 'institutional' groups and commended the team for doing this.

RN noted that it would be useful to note the high representation of respondents from the <16 age group in the questionnaire returns and that this in his view could have skewed the responses and hence analysis contained in the reports. RN also expressed concern how the weighting of opinion between one organisation and a group of school children would be conducted. It was clarified that opinions were not weighted and that the purpose of this initial engagement stage was to identify the range of views and opinions held by stakeholders rather than weight them.

IB considered that there was a message regarding an educational remit with respect to the particles to increase knowledge and understanding.

RN noted and concurred with the views expressed by some stakeholders that they were not happy with the change from monitoring and recovery with divers offshore to monitoring with the ROV without recovery before the outcome of the BPEO. RN expressed the belief that this was an example of where UKAEA had pre-empted the consultation process by making a management decision prior to the outcome of the consultation process. It was noted that UKAEA has no intention of pre-empting the findings of the BPEO assessment; it was also noted that the decision to move away from diving was on safety grounds and that using the ROV to carry out the studies at this time does not preclude the possible retrieval of particles in the future.

RN was not content with the language used in para 5.2.1 regarding one quarter of those questioned were not concerned. It could therefore be argued that three quarters were concerned. RN did not believe that this type of language was helpful and asked that it be redrafted.

3) Action: DL to note high representation from the <16 age group, to revise wording in 5.2.1 and clarify issue around the socio-economic outreach group

DL

DL noted comments received from Fred Barker and John Thurso – both were positive about the work. John Thurso requested that it be clarified that the socio-economic outreach group is not the Caithness Socio-Economic Strategy Group to avoid any potential confusion. Fred Barker commented that the analysis was laid out clearly and he was pleased to see UKAEA's draft point by point response.

RN wanted to be assured that in Phase 3 of the consultation, there would be ample opportunity and sufficient input from stakeholders from outwith the Caithness area.

DL noted that Entec is waiting for approval from UKAEA to finalise and issue the Stage Two documents. JL noted that UKAEA is awaiting comment from internal and external stakeholders before issuing the current draft Stage two documents to the public. It was noted that the ECSG would be concerned if the Stage two documents were not issued, this would undermine the credibility and transparency of the work.

PD noted that SEPA had issues regarding certain information in the Technical Résumé used in the consultation. PC and ME noted this and thanked SEPA for raising these issues at this early stage, prior to the full particles BPEO consultation. The ECSG noted that the Stage Two was about stakeholder perceptions and front end consultation on additional options and criteria rather than the full BPEO and that issues raised by SEPA would not have influenced existing perceptions.

- 4) Action: PC to address issues raised by SEPA regarding the Technical Résumé and to ensure that SEPA and external stakeholders (see above) have the opportunity to see consultation material prior to use**

PC

4.2 UKAEA response

JL introduced the draft documents. It was emphasised that the documents were work in progress. The documents were discussed.

RN requested that all options should not be dismissed without informing stakeholders and the public. FH noted that some may be screened out at an early stage but stakeholders will be informed of those screened out including the reasons why in Stage Three of the consultation.

IB enquired why Stage Three of the consultation needed to follow the issuing to the public of the DPAG final report. PD commented that following the DPAG report and recommendations, SEPA might make adjustments to the TID relating to particles.

JL and FH noted that the criteria and overall strategies can be worked up and scored prior to the publication of the DPAG final report. The DPAG report will need to be reviewed to assess whether it has any implications on the work completed and any appropriate changes made prior to the Stage Three consultation.

RN requested that the timescale of the particles management strategy should not be bound by the site decommissioning programme endpoint (2036) and that this should not be a reason for dismissing options or criteria suggested in Stage Two. JL & FH noted this.

5. BPEO NEXT STEPS

PC summarised UKAEA's plans for developing the BPEO scoring including forming the scoring panel that is to comprise nine people – four UKAEA and five non-UKAEA. The Chair of the scoring panel is to be non-UKAEA.

IB enquired whether it would be possible to have a SEPA observer at the scoring panel. PD responded that SEPA are likely to stand back from the scoring panel to ensure its neutrality in the issue as a regulator.

PC invited the ECSG to provide an observer to the scoring panel. IB expressed interest in this role. The ECSG agreed that IB is to adopt this role.

5) Action: FH to invite IB to observe the scoring panel

FH

6) Action: IB to attend scoring panel meetings as an observer

IB

ME outlined the current programme for forming the scoring panel and carrying out the scoring of the options. Current thinking is to form the scoring panel in May, agree the scoring method in June, score the options in July, prepare draft consultation materials August, review the materials following issuing of the DPAG final report in September, publish in October and consult in November.

It was highlighted that this programme is very ambitious and is dependent on the ROV defining the extent of the contamination and the DPAG report being published on time.

RN enquired whether there would be an opportunity to review materials. FH confirmed that this would be the case.

6. STAGE THREE CONSULTATION

DL presented the outline proposal for Stage Three of the consultation for discussion that comprised:

- Information provision (newsletter) to stakeholders via the website and post to those on the Dounreay Stakeholder list regarding outcomes of Stage Two, i.e. the revised list of options and the revised list of criteria;
- Workshops to present the options/strategies and unweighted scoring; identify views on the scoring and the relative importance of criteria; model the option/strategy scores using weighted criteria and discuss the outcomes; and
- Reporting on Stage Three back to the stakeholders.

The outline proposal was discussed.

PD emphasised the environmental aspect of BPEOs and noted that this should be represented throughout the literature and the description of the process. PD noted that if environment was not considered appropriately in the process, it is possible that SEPA may dismiss the process. RN noted that the consultation process was there to advise UKAEA of stakeholders' views. The following suggestions were made regarding the Stage Three process:

- The Stage should target 100 responses either through workshops or written responses;
- Stakeholders should be provided the opportunity to view information prior to the workshops through a combination of receiving information beforehand and making available the information through exhibitions. Such exhibitions would be made available to those not involved in workshops and consideration as to how these stakeholders' views are captured should be made. Consideration should be given to the weight placed on the views expressed through written responses and those following deliberation at workshops;
- The length of the workshops needs consideration, there were mixed views regarding the length and whether 4-5 hours was a reasonable length or too long;
- Workshop/s with 'technical stakeholders' may be longer than those with 'non-technical stakeholders';
- Two workshops outside Caithness should be considered;
- Following the workshops, the outcomes should be made publicly available for comment;
- The required analysis of Stage Three is defined prior to embarking on stakeholder engagement; and
- Venues and general arrangements should be attractive to encourage attendance and participation.

7) Action: DL, JL and FH to build up and refine the Stage Three consultation process taking account of suggestions made

DL, JL & FH

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting was proposed as either 19 or 22 September.

8. AOB

There was no other business