

**Minutes of 11th Submarine Dismantling Project Advisory Group**  
**23rd February 2011, Radisson Blu Hotel, Birmingham**

**In attendance**

Les Netherton (LN)	Chairman of SDP AG
Jane Tallents (JT)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
Di McDonald (DM)	Nuclear Submarine Forum
David Collier (DC)	Golder Associates
Andy Daniel (AD)	Industry representative (VT Group)
Steve Lewis (SL)	HSE NII
Bob Pirret (RP)	Babcock Stakeholder Liaison
Dr Paul Dorfman (PD)	Warwick University
Ian Avent (IA)	CANSAR
Dr Sue Jordan (SJ)	SDP MOD
Gareth Rowlands (GR)	DE&S Secretariat
Simon Tinling (ST)	SDP Asst Hd Approvals
Phil Northcott (PN)	SDP App RN
Mike Cushen (MC)	SDP MOD
Chris Magee (CM)	Green Issues Communications
Emma Webster (EW)	Green Issues Communications
Dave Wells (DW)	Nuvia Limited
David Griffiths (DG)	Environment Agency
Sally May (SMa)	MOD DE&S
Laura Kerr (LK)	SEPA
Martin Davis (MD)	MOD ND HMS SULTAN
Christine Bruce (CB)	MOD (Rosyth)
Peter Stacey (PS)	MOD (Devonport)
Fraser Thomson (FT)	Fife Council
Cllr Brian Goodall (BG)	Fife Council
Shelley Mobbs (SMo)	HPA
Nigel Parsons (NP)	MOD (Devonport)
Tub Aves (TA)	Nuclear Institute
David Whitworth (DW)	Nuclear Institute

**Presenter:**

Dr Ele Carpenter                      Goldsmiths, Arts Catalyst

**1. Welcome, Apologies and Introduction**

LN welcomed members of the SDP Advisory Group (AG) to Birmingham.

The following members of the AG gave their apologies to the meeting:

**Apologies for Absence**

Sean Morris (SM) Nuclear Free Local Authorities  
Gary McMeekan (GM) Environment Agency  
Cllr George H Regan (GRe) SCCORS

It was also noted that David Gatehouse no longer works for the NDA and is no longer a member of the AG.

**2. Notes of 10th SDP AG**

No issues were raised.

### 3. Action Update

Action Number	Description	Actionee	Status
10.1	SJ to confirm whether statutory bodies' responses to SEA Scoping A Part 1 can be put on SDP website	Sue Jordan	Complete
10.2	MC to confirm when the consultation plan and other documents will be circulated to the AG	Mike Cushen	Complete
10.3	EW to circulate the consultation plan	Emma Webster	Complete
10.4	EW to put Frazer Nash technical options paper onto the SDP website	Emma Webster	Complete
10.5	MC to discuss internally about the possibility of arranging a presentation about what currently takes place during a refit etc. and how this is managed	Mike Cushen	On the agenda for 23rd February
10.6	MC to discuss internally the possibility of arranging a presentation about dose risk assessment and dose control at the next meeting	Mike Cushen	To be undertaken at the next Advisory Group due to time constraints on the 23rd February.
10.7	MC to discuss internally about the possibility of having a presentation about recycling at the next meeting	Mike Cushen	On the agenda for 23rd February
10.8	EW to put the slide "How we apply regulation to the SDP" onto the website with appropriate explanation of abbreviations	Emma Webster	Complete
10.9	LN to discuss the future role and structure of the AG with the SDP team	Les Netherton	Complete

### 4. SDP Update

#### a. Project timeframe

MC ran through the baseline programme and updated members of the group on the progress that has been made since it last met.

MC informed members of the AG that the first (non-site specific) part of the SEA Statutory Consultation had been completed and that responses from Statutory Consultees to the second (dismantling site specific) part were being considered.

MC confirmed that the AG's SEA and Consultation Sub-Groups had helped to shape the SEA Scoping Report and planning for options analysis and public consultation.

DW asked for confirmation that the public consultation will not take place during holidays. MC confirmed that the MOD were aware that it was not good practice to hold consultations during the holiday period and that if it did fall over this time the consultation would be extended beyond the recommended 12 week period to accommodate. Questions were asked regarding the storage site options and whether this would require another public consultation. MC said that it may be necessary and that this would be determined at the time.

IA said that the Technical Options Study by Fraser Nash had added two extra attributes which had not been discussed by the group.

**Action 11.1: MC to investigate the additional attributes added to the TOS report and report back to the AG.**

There was a discussion about the use of terms such as recommendations and proposals. MC explained that the MOD's proposals would be presented to stakeholders and the public during public consultation; the MOD will then review its options analysis to take account of the results of public consultation before forming its recommendations.

**b. SEA/ Statutory Consultation**

SJ updated the group regarding the SEA process, recapping on the aims of the SEA, its current status and the consultation requirements.

Further to the request for information at the last meeting SJ outlined the feedback that had been received on the generic scoping report from the Statutory Bodies and other organisations. This feedback has been published as part of the updated scoping report that is currently on the web site.

**c. Potential Candidate Sites**

ST outlined the criteria that had been developed and the screening exercise that had been undertaken in order to identify potential candidate sites for initial dismantling. He also explained the change in approach that has been taken to sites for storage of ILW. Because of the developing nature of a national strategy for consolidation of interim storage of ILW and relevant themes within the NDA Strategy which is currently subject to consultation, the principles have yet to be established that would underpin a screening exercise for potential candidate sites for interim storage of ILW. Instead, MOD will take forward the generic categories of ILW storage sites into its assessment, namely those existing licensed or authorised sites owned by MOD, NDA or commercial organisations.

**d. Planning for Integrated Options Analysis**

ST referred members of the Advisory Group to the "SDP – Our Approach to Decision Making" document, which was to be discussed in more detail later in the meeting. ST took members of the group through a simplified explanation of the decision making process and the MOD's approach to complex decision making. ST presented a diagram showing an example „Combined Operational Effectiveness and Investment Appraisal" (COIEA) Plot

ST took members through the development of Integrated Options, comprising of the technical approach, initial dismantling site(s) and ILW storage solution/generic sites. He also highlighted how other integrative factors will be taken into account, such as: how and where other materials will be handled; transport of submarines and waste; regulatory frameworks required; and commercial frameworks required.

The technical approach considers three options: interim storage of Reactor Compartments (RCs), interim storage of Reactor Pressure Vessels (RPVs) and interim storage of packaged waste.

For initial dismantling there are two sites being considered and three options. For ILW storage there are three generic types of site within the category of licensed, authorised nuclear sites: existing licensed or authorised sites that are owned by NDA, MOD or commercial organisations.

ST then outlined the activities to be completed before the Integrated Options Analysis commences which include; confirm screening of the candidate sites for initial dismantling; formulate and confirm integrated options; develop cost model to inform Investment Appraisal for each integrated option; refine and confirm criteria for assessment of Operational Effectiveness and plan workshop to undertake Multi Criteria Decision Making Analysis (MCDA) workshops; develop data pack to inform MCDA; and ensure that the SEA and public consultation properly inform the Options Analysis.

### **e. Communications**

EW updated the group about the documents that had been published since the last Advisory Group meeting including: the SEA Scoping Report Update; SEA Non-Technical Summary; Technical Options Study and the Site Criteria and Screening Paper, all of which could be found on the SDP website.

EW informed the group that initial engagement has taken place with key local site stakeholders, which has enabled the scoping of the public consultation at a local level. Presentations have been given to both the Devonport and Rosyth Local Liaison Committees. The engagement was to brief them on the project and agree mechanisms for further liaison to identify existing local consultation arrangements and ensure effective local consultation plans.

Looking forward, EW outlined some key activities that are being developed in preparation for public consultation. They are:

The planning document '*SDP - Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement*'; input from elected representatives; developing stakeholder database; design of consultation document and associated materials; sourcing multimedia/graphics. She also noted that plans are evolving in accordance with the revised approach to interim ILW storage.

### **f. Conclusion**

MC provided a brief recap on the forward process for arriving at strategic decisions on SDP:

1. Conclude current phase of statutory consultation
2. Confirm SEA scope including candidate for initial dismantling
3. Undertake detailed options analysis and environmental assessment
4. Public consultation on MOD's proposals (currently planned for the second half of 2011)
5. Review options analysis and form recommendations
6. MOD Approvals process leading to decisions and response to public consultation

There was a discussion about the use of terms such as recommendations and proposals. MC explained that the MOD's proposals would be presented to stakeholders and the public during public consultation; the MOD will then review its options analysis to take account of the results of public consultation and stakeholder engagement before forming its recommendations.

## **5. Public Art Presentation**

Further to the discussion at the previous Advisory Group, Dr Ele Carpenter from the Nuclear Culture Network came to present her proposals for an art project relating to SDP. She outlined a proposed programme of activities that could take place.

PD asked how the project would be funded; EC said that they are applying for a number of grants and that it would help the bids if a letter of support were to come from the AG.

The AG recommends that MOD supports the SDP Arts project in principle, recognising that it may not be able to contribute to funding. Advisory Group members may wish to participate in their own right.

***Action 11.2: MC to hold discussions internally to determine whether a letter of support could be provided to assist with the grants bid process for Public Art Exhibition.***

## **6. Discussion of documents circulated for review**

JT advised that she had not received the email which circulated the documents for members' review prior to the meeting. The team acknowledged that some technical issues have been experienced which have prevented emails from reaching all members.

***Action 11.3: ST to investigate the issue of emails from the SDP not being received by some AG members.***

### **a. SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement**

The document was introduced to the Advisory Group. SMO commented that under the earlier approach to interim ILW storage the roadshow referred to in the document would have visited many more UK locations than it will do now. She questioned whether holding events in only two locations would be adequate for what is a local and a national consultation. Future revisions of the document should take this into account.

In response to this point, ST noted that two additional national events (at two central locations to be decided) had already been added to the consultation plan on the advice of the Consultation Sub-Group. These were already reflected in the document.

IA commented that it was not accurate to describe the purpose of the CIOP (p5, para 4.1) as „seeking initial views” since this consultation included actual proposals. He asked that it should be amended accordingly and JT asked if members might see the amended wording before it is published.

***Action 11.4: EW to amend the section on earlier consultation in ‘SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement’ and circulate to interested members of the Advisory Group.***

JT felt that further information regarding the history of the project should be included. It was felt that the document should also contain information about consultation relating to Intermediate Level Waste storage.

ST confirmed the intention for the documents to be published on the SDP website.

***Action 11.5: EW to make the appropriate changes to ‘SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement’ document and then upload to the website.***

***Action 11.6: All to send any comments through to EW regarding the ‘SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement’***

### **b. SDP – Our Approach to the Decision Making Process**

Members of the AG were happy with the document.

***Action 11.7: All to send any comments through to EW regarding the SDP – Our Approach to the Decision Making Process***

### **c. Questions for the Q&A**

Members considered the questions and were asked to send through any other questions to EW. DM suggested that questions about public inquiry be included.

***Action 11.8: All to send through additional questions for the Q&A to EW***

***Action 11.9: EW to add questions about Public Inquiry process to the Q&A.***

## **7. Sub-Group updates**

LN outlined the work of the consultation and SEA sub groups since the last meeting, explaining the role that had been fulfilled by members. He apologised for the lack of updates back to the Advisory Group and confirmed that one would be provided from the meeting at the end of March.

DM expressed an interest in being part of the Consultation Sub-Group and asked whether this would still be subject to Non Disclosure Agreements now that the Potential Candidate Sites for Initial Dismantling were in the public domain.

ST confirmed that Non Disclosure Agreements would still be required. This was to prevent draft

information or documents from being released prematurely before they had been properly considered and developed.

**Action 11.10: MC to consider whether the Consultation sub group could be expanded to include an additional member.**

BG asked whether it would be possible for discussions that are site specific to take place with local representatives in those areas to help shape the consultation process

**Action 11.11: MC to take away the principle of site specific discussions and report back to the Advisory Group.**

## **8. Presentation – Dockyard Activities**

Nigel Parsons, Christine Bruce and Peter Stacey outlined the work that takes place within the dockyards at Devonport and Rosyth that was of interest to members of the AG, further to the request for the presentation at the previous meeting.

**Action 11.12: EW to put the Dockyard Activities presentation on the SDP website.**

## **9. SDP Advisory Group**

### **a. Future Work Programme**

LN raised the issue of the future work programme and the role of the Advisory Group over the coming months.

**Action 11.13: ST to prepare a list of items for review by the Advisory Group**

### **b. Date of next meeting**

Next meeting to be held either in London or Reading. Date is to be confirmed but it is likely to be in July 2011.

### **c. SDP AG Future**

LN spoke to the Advisory Group about its future. The group agreed that there should be one further meeting before public consultation and one meeting after public consultation. The group felt that at this point it would be possible to determine if there was any need for further meetings, based on the Options Analysis data that had been put forward.

## **10. AOB**

IA commented on slide 16 of the Elected Representatives briefing, which contained figures and comparative illustrations for the amount of waste estimated to arise from the cut up and cut out methods. He felt that the slide was biased in favour of the cut-up method.. MC explained that the estimates on the slide were based on the best available data and that the comparative illustrations were intended to help non-expert stakeholders visualise the volume of waste likely to arise.

DM asked if it would be possible for a presentation to be put together regarding the French and Russian submarine dismantling experience. MC confirmed that the MOD would try to arrange this.

**Action 11.14: MC to arrange presentation regarding the French and Russian Submarine Dismantling.**

Meeting closed at 15.55pm

## Actions

Action Number	Description	Actionee	Status	Due date
11.1	MC to investigate the additional attributes added to the TOS report and report back to the AG	EW	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.2	MC to hold discussions internally to determine whether a letter of support could be provided to assist with the grants bid process for Public Art.	MC	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.3	ST to investigate the issue of emails from the SDP not being received by some AG members.	ST	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.4	EW to amend the section on previous consultation in „SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement” and circulate to interested members of the Advisory Group.	EW	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.5	EW to make the appropriate changes to the „SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement” document and then upload to the website.	EW	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.6	All to send any comments through to EW regarding the SDP – Our Approach to Public and Stakeholder Engagement	All	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.7	All to send any comments through to EW regarding the „SDP – Our Approach to the Decision Making Process” document	All	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.8	All to send through additional questions for the Q&A document to EW	All	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.9	EW to add questions about Public Inquiry process to the Q&A document.	EW	Ongoing	2 weeks from the meeting
11.10	MC to consider whether the sub group could be expanded to include an additional member.	MC	Ongoing	To be confirmed
11.11	MC to take away the principle of site specific discussions and report back to the Advisory Group.	MC	Ongoing	To be confirmed
11.12	EW to publish the Dockyard Activities presentation to the SDP website	EW	Complete	2 weeks from the meeting
11.13	ST to prepare a list of items for review by the Advisory Group	ST	Ongoing	4 weeks from the meeting
11.14	MC to arrange presentation regarding the French and Russian Submarine Dismantling experience (DW and AD to undertake presentation)	MC	Ongoing	At the next meeting