

Minutes of the 32nd AWE Local Liaison Committee Meeting

Held Thursday 6th March 2003

Present:

Malcolm Hutchinson	Executive Chairman, AWE	Chairman LLC
Bill Haight	Managing Director, AWE	
Alan Brandwood	Assurance Director, AWE	
Frank Winter	Director Infrastructure, AWE	
Graeme Hammond	Corporate Communications, AWE	
Avril Burdett	Community Relations Manager, AWE	Secretary LLC
Pamela Bale	Pangbourne Parish Council	
Peter Beard	Reading Borough Council	
Chris Bridges	Beech Hill Parish Council	
Roger Brown	West Berkshire Council	
Malcolm Bryant	Wokingham Unitary Authority	
Bill Cane	Mortimer West End Parish Council	Community Liaison Rep.
Margaret Dadswell	Aldermaston Parish Council	
Terry Faulkner	Tadley Town Council	
Tony Ferguson	West Berkshire Council	
Fish	Silchester Parish Council	
Peter Hobbs	Ufton Nervet Parish Council	
John Mazillius	Stratfield Mortimer Parish Council	
Ron Meredith	West Berkshire Council	
Jeff Moss	Swallowfield Parish Council	
Doug Mundy	Burghfield Parish Council	
John Parfitt	West Berkshire Council	
Tom Payne	Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	
Murray Roberts	Padworth Parish Council	
John Southall	Purley-on-Thames Parish Council	
Alan Sumner	Wokefield Parish Council	
Peter Taylor	Brimpton Parish Council	
Graham Ward	Woolhampton Parish Council	

Observers:

Alyson Morris	Environment Agency
Darren Baker	Environment Agency
Martin Sayers	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Mike Jeal	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Chris Kemp	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate

1. Apologies

Cllr Mike Broad; Cllr Angus Campbell; Cllr Maurice Eden; Cllr Chrissie Clemson; Cllr David Leeks; Cllr Terry Price who was represented by Cllr Fish; Cllr Michael Lochrie; Cllr Roy Waite Cllr Des Hoad; Geoff Eddy and Cllr Tim Whitaker.

At the 31st meeting, Mike Jeal of NII was incorrectly minuted as present.

2. Actions from the last meeting

Action 30/3: Report back on the expansion of the web site.

Action 31/5: Install a link on the AWE web site to take users to AWE's discharge information on the Environment Agency's web site.

AWE intended to improve their website and install a search engine and facilities to link to other sites such as the Environment Agency's. However they had to meet the MoD's security requirements and therefore could not use normal commercial routes. The current site had been

enlarged but once again had reached capacity. The Company was treating this as a matter of some urgency.

Action 30/4: Presentation at next meeting on REPPiR regulations. To be presented at the next meeting. George Sallit was unavailable.

Action 31/1: members interested in taking part in a review of the format of the Quarterly Report to contact Bill Cane.

Action complete: Three members had volunteered. The Chairman thanked John Mazillius, Bill Cane and Peter Taylor who had taken part in a workshop on 19th February. The review will continue and will probably include a further meeting with the group before a full report can be given to the LLC. More from Alan Brandwood at item (4).

Action 31/2: members to write to Alan Brandwood with any comments on AWE's key performance indicators. Action complete. Alan had not had any comments but he covered this issue later in the meeting.

Action 27/4 – Locate the tritium source at North Ponds. At the previous meeting the LLC had been told that AWE was awaiting a newt licence before work could begin on characterising the area close to North Ponds where the tritium source was located. A newt licence had been granted which allowed the work at the old North Ponds to proceed. Further works in the area required separate applications. The Reptile Licence for the site tip area was dependent on the habitat and population survey which would commence when the seasons changed and the appropriate documentation was compiled.

Action 31/3: Provide copies of the traffic studies to neighbouring councils. Ongoing, Frank Winter gave an update at agenda item 5.

Action 31/6: Secretary to explore the possibility of a visit to AWE Burghfield. A visit had been arranged.

Action 31/4: Look at the requirement for signs at the Burghfield entrance.

Cllr Mundy (Burghfield) had asked if warning signs could be placed at the entrance to the Burghfield site as more lorries were using that route due to a weak bridge on an adjacent road. Signs requested are 'Beware Lorries Turning Right'. **Action ongoing.**

3. Chairman's remarks: Malcolm Hutchinson, Executive Chairman

25 Year Contract

The Chairman said that the official signing of the extension of the AWEML contract from 10 to 25 years had been taken place on the previous Monday. This was excellent news for the future of AWE as it allowed the Company to take proper and strategic time frames to develop AWE for the 21st century.

The contract opened up access to private finance. He explained that government finance was always year to year and therefore did not always match the requirements. This would mean that the Site Development Strategy Plan could bring earlier cost savings on infrastructure.

This put the committee's role in perspective. The Chief of Defence Procurement, Sir Robert Walmsley had commented on AWE's communications strategy and openness at the signing of the contract. The Chairman said the he saw the LLC's role continuing and improving.

Modernising AWE

AWE was moving towards modernisation on several fronts. In addition to the official opening of the supercomputer suite, Blue Oak, AWE had been awarded a contract for the assessment phase for a new high-energy laser facility to support the UK nuclear programme. The laser will

use the latest technology to study plasma physics. The Chairman hoped that the laser would be built at Aldermaston. Currently AWE was the preferred site, but the final decision would not be made until the end of this assessment phase, the other option was that it would be sited at the Rutherford Appleton Laboratory at Harwell. The laser would also be used by outside bodies, especially academia for research purposes on other aspects of laser physics.

Work had also started on the demolition programme to clear the area intended for AWE's new Conference Centre.

Future of Burghfield

When Dr Lewis Moonie had announced the 25-year contract in the House of Commons, he had also announced that the AWE Burghfield site would remain in use. AWE had carried out a review of the two sites and concluded that there was a continuing need for both sites. MoD had now agreed to this. Members will be kept informed.

Cllr Ferguson asked whether there was a commitment to keep AWE Burghfield open for the duration of the 25-year contract. Bill Haight answered that the commitment was for the duration of the lifetime of Trident, therefore this would mean that AWE Burghfield would be kept open for the lifetime of the AWEML contract as a minimum. The situation would be kept under review.

Cllr Mundy said that he welcomed that decision for its impact on the Burghfield Community.

New Year's Honours

Two members of AWE staff had been recognised for their work in the Queen's New Years Honours List. David Youngs had received an MBE for his achievements in mathematics and computational physics. He is internationally renowned for his work on instability and turbulence modelling in fluid and plasma flows. His work is very important to AWE in a nuclear test ban era.

Peter Marshall had been awarded an OBE in 1990 for his contribution to nuclear arms control, this year he had been given one of the country's highest honours for his lifetime contribution, the Most Distinguished order of St Michael and St George (CMG). Peter, now retired, works with AWE as a consultant and had a career at AWE stretching back to 1963. He had worked on defining seismic events globally in support of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Media Issues

Both management and trades' unions at AWE had responded the previous month to correct inaccurate and misleading newspaper reporting of AWE's safety record.

In a misrepresentation of the Company's performance measures one national newspaper had claimed that AWE had breached a limit for radiation doses to its workers, this was followed up in the Reading Chronicle. The true situation was that both individual and collective doses to AWE staff had successively reduced over a ten-year period and were well within set limits. The national newspaper had published a letter from AWE setting the record straight. The Reading Chronicle had refused to do so.

Local newspapers had also carried reports about comments made by two local MPs following the award of the extension to the AWE management and operations contract, which gave an entirely misleading impression of the contract arrangements and the safety regime at AWE.

One MP had also criticised the work of the LLC, stating that members rubber-stamped AWE Reports over wine and canapés. AWE had also rebutted this in a letter to newspapers which had been printed. Bill Cane said that he had written to the Reading Chronicle but his letter had not been published.

MPs

AWE had invited all local MPs to visit. To date only Andrew Hunter and John Redwood had accepted. Some local MPs had been outspoken in their views, which the Company accepted as

their right, however, AWE preferred their comments to be backed by fact. For example, following the award of the 25-year contract, there had still been comments about Parent Company performance. AWE wanted to make it clear that what happened in parent companies was the responsibility of that company and had no bearing on safety at AWE. Performance at AWE was totally the responsibility of AWE plc. The Chairman said that he would like local MPs to see for themselves how committed AWE was to safety.

Staff Changes

Jim Stout, Director of Stockpile Management officially retired from his Director's post on March 1st, but would stay at AWE for a 2-month handover period as Dr David Glue took on that role. David has been part of the nuclear weapons programme, both at AWE and with the MoD since 1984 and looked forward to his new role during what he considered one of AWE's most exciting eras. Paul Hommert, Director of Research and Applied Science was leaving to take on a new role in the USA supporting Sandia's programmes for the Department of Defense and their relationship to the new Homeland Security Department. Paul's successor had not yet been announced. (Note: Subsequent to this meeting, Dr. Brian Bowsher was named as the new Director of Research and Applied Science). Graeme Hammond, Head of Corporate Communications was to retire at the end of April, but would stay for a handover period.

PASCALEA

The consultants who had conducted the Public and Stakeholder Consultation on AWE's Long-Term Environmental Aims (PASCALEA) had published their report and recommendations in December. The Chairman thanked Bill Cane and John Mazillius for all their hard work on this project. The prime purpose of the consultation process had been to seek the views of all of AWE's stakeholders concerning the environmental programme and to determine what priorities were important to them. AWE will make a public response in the near future. More from Frank Winter at item (5).

Police Club

AWE has a large contingent of Ministry of Defence Police at the Aldermaston site with responsibility for guarding, they have their own social club which closes at the end of March. This decision was entirely a matter for MoD police and the Chairman understood that it had been taken on the grounds that it no longer met their requirements. He also understood that the Police Club management was in discussions with the Rec-Soc management for joint membership. Rec-Soc management was also putting proposals forward to the AWE Executive on future sports and social facilities for the AWE staff. It was anticipated that public access would be an element of this. The Rec-Soc is managed as a private company and not as part of AWE.

There had been rumours that the Police Club was closing because AWE was civilianising their guard force. This was not true, they were two separate issues. AWE was considering whether it was feasible to employ a small number of civilian security personnel to undertake routine tasks such as pass checking. This would free up highly trained police for high-grade security work and the intention was to improve security arrangements. There would continue to be an armed police presence on all open gates.

Cllr Ferguson asked whether there would be a reduction in the number of MoD Police on the sites. Alan Brandwood explained that there would be a reduction in the complement, but, as seen in parliamentary questions, there were recruitment problems which meant that AWE had not been able to man up to that figure. In effect therefore there would be no reduction in actual numbers of MoD Police at AWE. Allowing the recruitment of civilian security personnel, as at other MoD establishments, would free up highly trained police personnel for the more specialised tasks. Cllr Ferguson asked how many police there were at AWE and was told that the information was classified on the grounds of national security. Cllr Mundy asked whether the gates would still be manned by armed police and was assured that they would be, the civilian security personnel would be a supplementary presence, not a replacement.

Bill Cane asked for assurance that any guards employed were of the highest possible standard, he was assured by Bill Haight that AWE's requirements were very specific. He said that the decision to employ civilian guards had not been made, but if it were, not only would they be of a very high standard, but they would also be trained by the Ministry of Defence Police. Part of the scoping study would be to visit facilities which any potential supplier already guarded.

4. Health, Safety & Environmental Issues: Alan Brandwood, Assurance Director

Key Performance Indicators

(See attached tables pages 11/12)

Alan Brandwood said that the 2002 performance should be judged against the past 10 years' performance. There had been 13 KPIs with a total of 18 measures, two were introduced as new KPIs in 2002 and so there was no data for comparison. 12 measures had shown either an improvement or maintained standard, in four areas performance was not as good as in previous years. The total injury events and lost time accident figures had been discussed at the previous two meetings, and Alan had told the LLC what measures had been put in place to improve.

Cllr Tony Ferguson asked that the KPIs which had been dropped in 2002 be included on Table 1. He also felt that the Company should not have dropped the KPIs in 2002 and 2003 which related to regulatory matters. AWE senior management felt that as the target was zero and any deviation from that was reported in the quarterly report, it did not add any value to present this information in graphical form. Importantly the LLC/AWE group reviewing information presented to the LLC had **not** requested such information.

Action 32/1: To add the 2000/2001/2002 KPIs which had been dropped to Table 1

Cllr Peter Taylor asked whether the table of results of the KPIs could be related to hours worked. Alan Brandwood pointed out that hours worked was not always the issue, in some cases for example in decommissioning, it was the level of hazard which was important.

John Mazillius asked whether AWE performance could be compared to other industry. Alan said that in setting AWE's targets he benchmarked against outside industry, looking at the best and comparing AWE's performance. The programme of work for the coming year was also taken into account.

Lost time accidents had shown a marked decline in performance. The LLC had been briefed on AWE's actions to reduce accidents. Most accidents continued to be slips, trips, falls, strains and minor cuts. The security events index was raised compared with 2001, this was due to it's measurement being brought into the overall Assurance system – this meant that the marking was much harsher, and did not reflect a deterioration in security performance.

Members queried why the 2003 target for recycling office waste had been set at below that achieved in 2002.

Action 32/2: Explain the performance and targets for re-cycled office waste.

Quarterly Report

Alan Brandwood explained that the spike in the table on tritium discharges to the Pangbourne Pipeline/Trade Waste, which was still within EA limits and AWE's targets, was a discharge of high volume, low activity legacy waste.

He reported that the EA had issued AWE with a letter which it described as a "caution". This related to an event in February 2002 involving a waste water spill. The LLC had been notified at the time. The event had been investigated immediately and there had been no injury to any person or any sign of damage to the environment, no material had been released off site. The incident was classified as a level 2 incident and systems were put in place to prevent a re-

occurrence. AWE had reported the incident to the EA giving details of the actions taken. The Environment Agency had not requested any further action from AWE but letters were exchanged on the issue. Just before Christmas, AWE had decided to take the matter no further and accepted the caution, despite formally disagreeing with the Environment Agency on the outcome.

Letter from Cllr Taylor

Alan Brandwood had received a letter from Peter Taylor about risks from chemicals used at AWE. The letter was technical with mathematical formulae. Alan explained that AWE's chemical discharges did not harm the public, AWE staff or the environment. The EA set stringent limits which AWE adhered to, the limits were set at a low level to protect flora and fauna and so were well below limits which might harm humans. If AWE breached the Environment Agency limits, there was a large margin of safety built in. Also, if AWE did breach its limits and cause harm, the EA would prosecute.

Peter Taylor said that he understood the risk to the environment and the public but he was concerned that the public should understand the relative magnitude of the various risks. Cllr Taylor said that in his opinion the risk to the public from AWE's traffic was greater than that from the work carried out there.

Alan issued an invitation for Cllr Taylor to come to AWE and discuss the matter with AWE's experts. Cllr Taylor added that he needed to see the risks from AWE in order of magnitude so that he knew that AWE was tackling the right problems as a priority. Alan assured members that the process of setting discharge limits took into account thresholds, risk and concentration.

Action 32/3: Copy Peter Taylor's letter to LLC members. **Copy included with the minutes.**

Visit of Baroness Young

Baroness Young had visited AWE Aldermaston on the 4th March 2003. The visit had been a success and she had praised AWE as having several examples of environmental best practice, such as PASCALEA, the ten-year plan, communications with stakeholders (including LLC and EA) and AWE's overall performance on environmental issues. She had also met with Bill Cane and representatives of the MOD.

LLC Workshop on the AWE Quarterly Assurance Report

Alan Brandwood thanked Bill Cane, John Mazillius and Peter Taylor who had represented the LLC at the workshop. The reason for the workshop was to look at the LLC's quarterly report alongside reports given to other stakeholders in order to try to rationalise the number and type of reports produced. The report which the LLC received was produced only for them, with copies being placed in the Houses of Parliament Libraries. The cost of production of the many different reports outweighed their value from AWE's perspective.

Any new report would take into account the findings of the PASCALEA study, the employee survey and the requirements of other stakeholders such as the media and MPs. The aim was to provide reliable information which satisfied all AWE's stakeholders without increasing the resources required to produce it. Alan said that once AWE had considered all stakeholder views they would share the findings with the workshop group.

Pangbourne Pipeline (PPL) Discharges

John Southall asked about how and where sampling was carried out around the Pangbourne Pipeline discharge when the Thames was in flood. Alan explained that trials had been carried out to show the dispersal pattern and sampling checks had been carried out. Darren Baker (EA) said that all discharges were modelled and assessed in flood and drought conditions. Monitoring confirmed the model was correct. Alan Brandwood added that AWE also carried out its own sampling in all seasons and all weather conditions. Bill Haight added that AWE had spoken to landowners in the area and monitoring was offered at the landowner's request.

Cllr Pamela Bale asked where the samples were taken during floods, she was told that the sampling points were selected as the most appropriate place to give useful results whilst keeping the safety of staff a priority. One member suggested that discharges through the pipeline should only be made when the state of the river was appropriate. Frank Winter said that operational arrangements took account of this, also, that AWE was progressing well with the replacement facility to deal with the discharges currently made through the pipeline.

Action 32/4: Darren Baker (EA) to supply details of monitoring around the PPL discharge point.

Action 32/5: To give more information on the operating arrangements covering discharges via the Pangbourne Pipeline at the next meeting.

5. Infrastructure Issues: Frank Winter, Director Infrastructure

Accident

Frank Winter told members about an accident to a contractor in a facility under decommissioning which had resulted in the loss of the top of the contractor's thumb. The contractor was not following the AWE documented safe-systems-of-work, and preventative corrective action has been agreed to with the company performing the work.

PASCALEA

The PASCALEA study was now complete and staff were finalising AWE's response to the issues raised. Frank Winter warned that it would be impossible to satisfy everyone's expectations. Some of the views expressed may have been impractical and others were outside of the scope of the consultation as some strayed into Government policy. However, he said he would attempt to show how the views of stakeholders had influenced AWE's approach, or explain why the Company was not able to do so. AWE's report would be issued by 31st March 2003 and would be circulated to AWE staff, LLC members and the public.

Two main themes were evident in the consultation report, namely that the local community had few worries about AWE plc's ability to manage the AWE sites safely and in full compliance with all environmental regulations, and that they had a high degree of confidence in the expertise of AWE staff. In fact, local people appeared to have a greater concern about the effects of traffic around the sites than for any industrial or radiological hazards.

In response to a question, Frank Winter said that the Company would be taking some actions following the PASCALEA study, one was to foster a greater understanding within the community of how AWE is regulated.

The PASCALEA report and recommendations can still be viewed on the PASCALEA website www.pascalea.com

Action 32/6: To ensure that all LLC members receive a copy of the PASCALEA Report.

Behavioural safety

Behavioural Safety had been discussed several times during recent meetings, Frank Winter explained how this was being trialled in one of his facilities currently under decommissioning. He said that some 80 people were involved in hands-on decommissioning in this facility. Firstly they had consulted with AWE Trade Unions and with agreement, the Pilot Behavioural Safety Scheme had been introduced into the facility in August 2002. A voluntary Steering Group had been formed from the shop floor operatives guided by a manager from Review Learn & Improve (RL&I), this group was empowered to spend money to improve safety. The Steering Committee Members underwent a period of training to understand the concepts of Behavioural Safety and develop implementation plans for their own work environment. A number of sessions had been held with their colleagues to identify deficiencies in working practices and more importantly how these

could be improved from a safety point of view. A glossary of recognised descriptive terms were drawn up and were now applied to what had become routine observations.

Behavioural safety looked at housekeeping, storage, lifting and moving equipment, the right tools for the job, doing a job the safest way, working at height and personal protective equipment. One aspect was to apply a simple test to the housekeeping in the area by asking whether a blindfolded person could walk through the facility without tripping or slipping on objects needlessly left around. This test raised awareness of the high standard of housekeeping expected at AWE. The whole culture was of no name: no blame. Any person could observe any other person, not just managers watching their staff.

The Steering Group Members had now been performing routine observations of their colleagues since October 2002. Approximately 14-16 man-hours per week were spent carrying out observations. The data that had been recorded since October and was soon to be fed into a newly delivered software package which would enable interrogation and produce graphical representations on how safety behaviours had improved (or otherwise). Even without this feedback the scheme was providing visible improvements in the attitude of the workforce towards safety, improvement in housekeeping and a number of high impact, low cost safety improvements had been introduced.

Behavioural safety is all about AWE's people being more aware and more responsible for their own safety and that of their colleagues.

Telephone Alerting System

The system was now fully installed and technically operational. The alerting messages had been agreed with all interested parties and recorded and installed on the system. The telephone numbers were also fully loaded onto the system. All testing had been completed and the necessary subsequent modifications to the system had been completed.

Progress has been delayed a little because of the need to design, and agree with the vendor, enhancements to the system to make it sufficiently robust and proof against accidental or malicious initiation. The testing regime had been exhaustive, including attempts to "hack" into the vendor's computer system. AWE could now be confident that the system met its very stringent requirements.

The only remaining action was to formally agree and record protocols with Thames Valley Police for the use of the system. The system was expected to go "live" within a week or two.

AWE's Corporate Communications Department was drafting a publicity plan. The REPIIR leaflet distribution would, as planned, include information on the system. It would also give those with "ex-directory" telephone numbers, the opportunity to have their numbers added to the database. All normal telephone numbers would be updated automatically by the system every quarter.

Cllr Doug Mundy asked how people working outdoors would be alerted. He was told that any mobile phone number could be added to the system.

Bill Cane thanked AWE for putting in the system, he felt that it would be an added assurance to the local community. In answer to questions Frank Winter pointed out that this was not the total emergency plan, but an enhancement to what already existed. The Police would also be involved in alerting people, additional information would be given on local radio and TV, schools and local authorities would also be informed and put their own procedures into action.

Road Safety Issues

Speed Limits

The 50 mph speed limits which had been installed on the A 340 Paices Hill were not due to AWE negotiating with West Berkshire Council, but undertaken under the speed limit review recommendations for 2001/2002.

The AWE proposals for a 40-mph speed limit around site were being addressed with West Berkshire Council. They were currently discussing the recommendations internally before submitting to the police, members and other interested parties.

External Road Improvements

AWE Traffic Consultants, in conjunction with West Berkshire Council, had completed the proposed road improvement report. The report identified eight possible road improvement schemes, plus new signage on surrounding roads. The proposals were being reviewed by AWE in relation to current and future traffic movement and safety before any decision on implementation was undertaken.

Traffic Surveys

AWE had started to produce a Travel Plan (Green Paper) together with a Transport Strategy Plan. The Travel Plan would identify the current AWE Staff travel patterns and any improvements that could be made in travelling to and from the Aldermaston and Burghfield Sites.

The Transport Strategy Plan would identify traffic movements associated with construction phases being carried out at Aldermaston or Burghfield and recommend traffic movements to ensure minimal impact on the roads and environment surrounding Aldermaston and Burghfield.

Paices Hill

AWE continued to be concerned about the lack of opening hours for the Paices Hill Re-Cycling Waste Area. Fly tipping continued to occur outside the gates when the area was closed. As a result AWE was experiencing increased rubbish by the fences from some of this waste as it was blown across the road. In one recent instance rubble had been fly tipped and this moved into the road causing a significant road hazard. AWE staff had cleared the rubbish from the road to remove the hazard.

AWE had met with a representative of West Berkshire Council. They had a CCTV camera in operation but apparently it had been vandalised. Various other suggestions were made by AWE which West Berkshire would look at. The Company drew their attention to a joint Environment Agency/Local Authority campaign in Wiltshire which was successfully addressing a similar problem.

Fire Safety at Aldermaston & Burghfield

98% of all fire risk assessment in habitable facilities on the Aldermaston and 100% of all fire risk assessment in habitable facilities on the Burghfield site had been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Workplace Regulations.

All facilities were required to carry out a review of their fire risk assessments if they carried out alterations to the facility, if they altered the staffing numbers of a facility or if they altered or amended the process work carried out in a facility. Additionally, over and above the requirements of the Workplace Regulations, AWE will carry out reviews of fire risk assessments every three years. AWE had trained over 80 staff to be fire risk assessors. This was in addition to the fire safety advisors who were constantly working on fire safety issues on the AWE sites.

AWE Fire Service

The AWE Fire Service had provided enhanced levels of fire fighter to cover the AWE sites during the periods of Industrial action by the Local Authority Fire Service.

Mineral Extraction in Aldermaston

Members asked whether AWE had raised objections to the proposed extraction of 4 million tons of gravel adjacent to Aldermaston Village and Cllr Terry Faulkner asked whether AWE had responded to Basingstoke & Deane's Plan. Frank Winter said that AWE had responded, AWE looked at any impact on AWE. This also included the impact on traffic around the sites.

6. Any other business

John Mazillius asked for details of findings from an NII inspector's visit. Mike Jeal (NII) answered that if there had been serious problems they would have been reported. Many discussions took place on many topics during these inspections and it would be impractical to report them all to the LLC. He assured members that any significant issues would be reported.

John Mazillius said that it was very reassuring to know that the regulators were content with AWE's performance and only finding minor problems.

Closing Remarks

The Chairman thanked Ron Meredith, West Berkshire's Emergency Planning Manager who was retiring in the near future. He thanked him for his help and support, not only at the Local Liaison Committee but also on his work with AWE's Emergency Planning Group.

7. Date of next meetings

Thursday 5th June

Thursday 4th September

Thursday 4th December

Company Performance from 2000

	External Performance Indicators	2000	2001	2002	
1	Total Number of Staff Injury Events	494	408	457	
2	Staff Lost Time Accident Rate (per 100,000 hours worked)	0.25	0.16	0.36	
3	Event Index	964	826	810	
4	Staff Non- Attendance (% of total hours worked)	2.3	3.1	3.1	
5	Maximum Individual Annual Whole Body Radiation Exposure (mSv)	4.96	2.3	2.13	
6	Collective Dose for Classified Persons and Monitored Radiation Workers (mSv)	517	461	266	
7	Security Index	525	324	106	
8	Waste Recycling	Office Waste (%)	N/M	N/M	31
		Assets Waste (%)	N/M	N/M	59
9	Performance against authorisations for liquid waste discharged via the Pangbourne pipeline and Trade Waste	Total Alpha (MBq)	17.7	9	8.70
		Total Beta (MBq)	23.5	13.9	11.76
		Total Tritium (GBq)	2.8	2.3	6.44
10	Performance against authorisations for gaseous discharges	Total Alpha (MBq)	0.1	0.07	0.11
		Total Beta (MBq)	0.09	0.08	0.09
		Total Tritium (TBq)	8.3	5.6	16.78
11	Internal EFQM Assessment Score	N/M	300-350	324	
12	% of Company Non-conformances (303s) closed to agreed timescales	N/M	N/M	58	
13	% of Senior Managers on schedule to complete 15 plant visits where assurance issues are covered	N/M	N/M	96	

Company Targets from 2000

	External Performance Indicators	2000	2001	2002	2003	
1	Total Number of Staff Injury Events	N/M	420	365	360	
2	Staff Lost Time Accident Rate (per 100,000 hours worked)	0.3	0.2	0.14	0.16	
3	Event Index	N/M	771	740	720	
4	Staff Non Attendance (% of total hours worked)	3.5	3.5	2.7	2.7	
5	Maximum Individual Annual Whole Body Radiation Exposure (mSv)	5	4	3	2	
6	Collective Dose for Classified Persons and Monitored Radiation Workers (mSv)	750	450	275	250	
7	Security Index	N/M	473	290	760	
8	Waste Recycling	Office Waste (%)	N/M	N/M	25	28
		Assets Waste (%)	N/M	N/M	55	60
9	Performance against authorisations for liquid waste discharged via the Pangbourne pipeline and Trade Waste	Total Alpha (MBq)	65	30	30	15
		Total Beta (MBq)	65	35	25	20
		Total Tritium (GBq)	40	24	20	15
10	Performance against authorisations for gaseous discharges	Total Alpha (MBq)	0.3	0.25	0.15	0.12
		Total Beta (MBq)	0.3	0.25	0.15	0.12
		Total Tritium (TBq)	20	20	18	15
11	Internal EFQM Assessment Score	N/M	N/M	360	380	
12	% of Company Non-conformances (303s) closed to agreed timescales	N/M	N/M	75	Internal Target	
13	% of Senior Managers on schedule to complete specified number of plant visits per quarter where assurance issues are covered	N/M	N/M	100	100	